

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



**The Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education:
Perspectives and Contexts
by
Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J.**

BOSTON COLLEGE

JAN 5 0 1984

PROPERTY OF BARST LIBRARY

Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*
in the spirit of Vatican Council II

Vol. XV

November, 1983

No. 5

and

Vol. XVI

January, 1984

No. 1

THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

consists of a group of Jesuits from various provinces who are listed below. The members were appointed by the Fathers Provincial of the United States.

The Purpose of the Seminar is to study topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and to communicate the results to the members of the Assistancy. The hope is that this will lead to further discussion among all American Jesuits--in private, or in small groups, or in community meetings. All this is done in the spirit of Vatican Council II's recommendation to religious institutes to recapture the original charismatic inspiration of their founders and to adapt it to the changed circumstances of modern times. The members of the Seminar welcome reactions or comments in regard to the topics they publish.

To achieve these purposes, especially amid today's pluralistic cultures, the Seminar must focus its direct attention sharply, frankly, and specifically on the problems, interests, and opportunities of the Jesuits of the United States. However, many of these interests are common also to Jesuits of other regions, or to other priests, religious men or women, or lay men or women. Hence the studies of the Seminar, while meant especially for American Jesuits, are not exclusively for them. Others who may find them helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

THE MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR ARE:

- Charles J. Beirne, S.J., John LaFarge House, 6 Sumner Road, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-547-5310
- Patrick J. Burns, S.J. Provincial Offices, 1434 West State Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233. 414-344-7464
- Gregory I. Carlson, S.J., Marquette Jesuit Residence, 1404 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233. 414-344-7900
- Philip C. Fischer, S.J., Secretary of the Assistancy Seminar, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108. 314-652-3700
- George E. Ganss, S.J., Chairman of the Assistancy Seminar and Editor of its *Studies*. His address is: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108 314-652-5737
- Gerald R. Grosh, S.J., Loyola University, 6525 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois 60626. 312-274-3000
- E. Edward Kinerk, S.J., Jesuit Novitiate, 1901 Eudora St., Denver, Colorado 80220. 303-320-6297
- Brian O. McDermott, S.J., Weston Jesuit Community, 20 Sumner Road, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-547-3742
- Leo J. O'Donovan, S.J., Weston School of Theology, 3 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-492-1960
- William C. Spohn, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 LeRoy Avenue, Berkeley, California 94709. 415-841-9121
- Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J., Jesuit Tertianship, 907 Lydia St., Austin, Texas 512-477-7824

Copyright, 1983, by The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



**The Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education:
Perspectives and Contexts
by
Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J.**

**Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their aggiornamento
in the spirit of Vatican Council II**

Vol. XV

November, 1983

No. 5

and

Vol. XVI

January, 1984

No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editor's Foreword	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. THE CHURCHES AND THEIR COLLEGES	7
PART II. THE AMERICANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION	16
A. Service	16
B. The Elective System	19
C. Professionalism	21
D. Excursus on the Curriculum	24
E. Laicization	28
1. The Nonprofessing Professor	28
2. The Uninitiated Professor	29
3. Thirty Years of Growth	31
PART III. REESTABLISHING THE COMMON MISSION	36
A. Symbolic National Cooperation	36
B. Earlier Projects	38
1. The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America	38
2. The Presbyterian Higher Education Task Force	39
PART IV. THE JESUITS AND THEIR COLLEGES	40
A. Forty Years of Work: JEA	42
B. The Third Horizon: Jesuit Governance	46
C. The Society's Apostolate in 1972	49
PART V. THE JESUITS AND THE AJCU: REESTABLISHING THE COMMON MISSION	52
A. Project 1: The Flawed Process	54
B. The Provincials' Decisions	60
1. The Rationales	61
2. Structures for Relationships	62
PART VI. FIRST STEPS IN THE RENEWAL OF THE APOSTOLATE	67
CONCLUSION	70
APPENDIX: THE JESUIT MISSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION.	
Letter from the American Provincials (Easter, 1978)	81
Footnotes	96
CHECKLISTS: The Publications of the INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES	112
and of the AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR	115

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Since World War II began in 1939, Jesuits engaged in educational work, whether secondary or higher, have been living through a period of changes unprecedented in number, rapidity, or extent. Trying, like other educators, to cope with them one by one as they appeared, these Jesuits saw trees simply innumerable but had no map of the forest as a whole. Not surprisingly, they often felt bewildered or lost. Where are we? Where is it all going?

The comprehensive article in this present issue of *Studies*, it seems to the present writer, provides just such a map. Father Joseph A. Tetlow sketches the early history of the church-related schools in America, including those of the Jesuits; and against this background he expounds, in greater and greater detail, the history of Jesuit schools during the past five decades of change. This procedure furnishes us a far better perspective for understanding each detail and for finding our way into the future.

Father Tetlow's study has sprung from unusually wide experience which admirably equipped him for this task. A member of the Province of New Orleans ordained in 1960, he holds a doctorate in American social and intellectual history from Brown University. He taught classics in the old-time juniorate of his province, was Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of Loyola University of New Orleans, and President of the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, California. He was an associate editor of *America*, in which he wrote "The Word" for a spell of years. With Fathers John W. Padberg, James L. Connor, Vincent J. Duminuco, and Robert A. Mitchell (President), he formed the team which produced the Jesuit Conference's Project 1: its action-reflection project on Jesuits in education. At present he is the Director of Tertian Fathers, and concurrently spiritual director for the clergy of the diocese of Austin, Texas. He is also a member of the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality; and we are very grateful to him for this helpful contribution.

George E. Ganss, S.J., Chairman
The American Assistancy Seminar

THE JESUITS' MISSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION
PERSPECTIVES AND CONTEXTS

by

Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J.
Tertian Director
907 Lydia Street
Austin, Texas 78702

INTRODUCTION

I think that a Jesuit in one of our colleges or universities today is more like Matteo Ricci in China in the sixteenth century than like Michael Walsh, say, at Boston College earlier in this century, or Arbie Lemieux at Seattle University. For our institutions today, compared with the fragrant libraries, mellow wooden classrooms, and rosters of familiar names a generation ago, have become a strange and foreign country. They are, like Ricci's China, a complex society magnificent in its resources, rigid in its procedures and customs, stratified in vague but resistant ways, and holding out what our companions have from the start called "great promise."

But though this year is the 400th anniversary of Ricci's entrance into China, that is not one of the historical occasions for writing this. However, three other pertinent anniversaries coincide this year. First, Easter of 1983 was the fifth since the provincials wrote "The Jesuit Mission in Higher Education," a letter reconfirming our commitment to this magnificent and somewhat strange apostolic field.¹ Then, this fall marks the tenth anniversary of the beginning of Project 1. Finally, this year is the fiftieth since the Assistancy Commission on Higher Education finished its work, which was the first formal national project among Jesuits in this apostolate. Since each of these is a bench mark in the rise of Jesuit higher education, the anniversary is a good time to reflect on the spirituality of Jesuits in this apostolate, the development of Jesuit higher education, and the common mission the Jesuits and the institutions are supposed to share.

The end of academic year 1983-1984 will also mark the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Jesuit Education Association (JEA), which Father General Wlodimir Ledochowski set up on this Commission's

recommendation (1934-1970).² The half-century of history that begins with this founding is absorbing but largely unpublished.³ A mere list of developments is suggestive: the founding of Fairfield (1942) and Lemoyne (1946) and the acceptance of Wheeling (1955); the dropping of Latin as a requisite for the B.A.; the multiplication of professional degrees, departments, and schools; coeducation; the G.I. Bill and other federal fundings; racial desegregation; the demise of *in loco parentis*; laicized boards; separate incorporation; the dismantling of the Jesuit core curriculum; the appointment of the first non-Jesuit higher administrator and the nonappointment of the first Jesuits with doctorates ("in our own schools!"). For every one of our colleges and universities, this last half-century has been a roiling cascade of growth and change, but a cascade that was canalized as Catholic higher education flowed out of the backwater of the intellectual ghetto into the mainstream of church-related and of secular higher education in America.⁴

At the beginning of the last half-century, Jesuits knew why we were fighting the Great Depression to keep the colleges open. We thought of them as what Merrimon Cuninggim calls the Embodying College, "the mirror, almost the embodiment, of the denomination . . . the Reflection of the Church, true in every major respect, sound in faith and observances."⁵ The Jesuit walking across John Carroll's campus considered the college the incarnation of Catholicism, and he felt neither reluctant nor defensive about it, but enthusiastic and cheerful. And he imagined the college's purpose just an extension of the Jesuit spirituality at the core of his own personal and communal life.⁶

But a quarter of a century later, in 1957--the year of Sputnik, John F. Kennedy's Pulitzer Prize for *Profiles in Courage*, Jack Kerouac's jazz-sex-and-dope celebration in *On the Road*, and the Eisenhower Doctrine on the Middle East--we had changed both our colleges and our attitude toward them. We had moved away from the Embodying College, whose most visible allegiance had been to the Church and the Society, which definitively shaped what we taught and how we taught it.⁷ By 1957 we thought of our particular institution as a Proclaiming College, whose foremost allegiance was to academic professionalism and excellence in higher education. We had become convinced that academic excellence was the best way to serve the Church, for an academically excellent college proclaimed Christians' fearless commitment to the whole truth. We still had the power to make each

institution "joyously announce its affiliation with its sponsoring denomination at every appropriate occasion."⁸

The shifting continued. By 1970--a year of antiwar marches, student strikes, and tenure conflicts--Jesuits feared that their colleges neither embodied Jesuit ideals nor proclaimed Christians' commitment to the truth. A Jesuit was likely to think his particular college had gotten too autonomous for that, and he could only hope that it was what Cuninggim calls a Consonant College: "an institution that, feeling independent in its own operation, is committed to the tradition of its related church and to consistency with that tradition in its own behavior."⁹ We were not even sure that our colleges were committed to Jesuit tradition and could elicit behavior that suited it; for we were witnessing the behavior of a countercultural revolution among the students, which seemed to mock every tradition, and the behavior of a conformist revolution among faculty, administrators, and boards, which seemed to be making Jesuit colleges as ordinary and interchangeable as Model T's. Younger Jesuits were simply not sure that any institution could be consonant with gospel values and worthy of religious allegiance.

During the Vietnam era--precisely when we had to rediscover our own apostolic purposes after Vatican II and through General Congregations 31 and 32--Jesuits began to recognize that the Society did not propose in its apostolate the same aims and purposes as its institutions proposed. We discovered that the common mission once shared by Society and institution was failing. Further, we began finding out that our own ideas differed on what a Jesuit institution should be, and on what each particular college and university should be. We found earlier ideals no longer plausible: The Embodying College, almost a little Jesuit seminary, and the Proclaiming College, never missing a chance to show and tell how learning and athletics and artistry were for the greater glory of God. Were we expected to hope for Consonant Colleges--or could institutions that had their own educational mission, independently chosen and enacted, truly stand in the Jesuit tradition?

Our questions have not gone away. The *Ratio studiorum* of 1832, unlike the United States Constitution of 1787, is now a historical relic, interesting and still instructive but no longer functional. We conduct institutions now in the mainstream of American higher education, and are keenly aware that the common mission of the Society and its institutions is under the unique dominion neither of the Society nor of the institution.

We are somehow surprised to find a partner with a mind of its own.

Does this mean that American Jesuits have lost their historically distinctive role in higher education? That we have lost any corporate role whatsoever? If we are not just waiting around making our secular heirs restive, what is our mission in these strange and splendid places?

What I have to say about these questions falls into six parts and a conclusion.

First: The Churches and Their Colleges. I believe that we cannot understand the Jesuit situation unless we understand that our institutions are now an integral part of a centuries-old American tradition in church-related higher education. We all know that, beginning with Harvard and Georgetown, the churches in America have founded colleges; perhaps we have not given enough attention to the threefold pattern those church-related colleges follow in their histories: Some continue faithful to their churches' purposes, as have Loras (1839) and Wheaton (1860). Some do not continue at all, as St. Joseph's in Bardstown, Kentucky (1848), did not, and St. Ignatius in Pend d'Orielles, Montana (1882). Some grow altogether secular in purpose and functioning, as have Brown (1767) and Amherst (1821). Jesuit colleges, it is true, have moved into the full cycle of American collegiate tradition only during the last four or five decades. But we have moved very completely into that cycle and now have no reason to believe that the problems which separated other institutions from their sponsoring religious bodies will not eventually push our institutions into all three categories. In James Hennesey's piquant phrases:

Will the college and the church decide to renew their marriage vows? Will they head for the divorce court? Or do they want to just hang in there for the sake of the children?

Second: The Americanization of Higher Education. Through 350 years, American colleges and universities have slowly developed into what John W. Padberg called "a unique American hybrid of English college, German graduate research institute, and community service center."¹¹ He could have added that the service center included technical training in everything from oil production to opera production among the "dizzying variety of programs,

departments, institutes, schools" the American college and university has created "to perform its self-acknowledged three-fold function of teaching, research, and service."¹²

Along the way in that hybridization, several developments affected the church-related colleges deeply, and a brief look at them makes the present situation of the colleges, Jesuit included, more understandable. They are: the ideal of service, the elective system, the curriculum, the emergence of professionalism in research and in training, and a phenomenon I shall call "laicization," one of the most far-reaching results of the explosive post-World War II growth in higher education.

Third: Reestablishing the Common Mission. During the awakening of interest in religion that followed World War II, the denominations began to feel that they had grown slack in pursuing the mission in higher education that they shared with the colleges they had founded. At the same time, swift growth forced individual institutions to review educational goals. The inspection was disturbing: Small sectarian colleges maintained religious purposes clearly; but larger, more established colleges seemed far along in secularizing. Consequently, churches and colleges both became active in confirming their common mission in religious higher education.

While Jesuit provincials were composing their Easter Letter of 1978, an ecumenical group was preparing an extraordinary meeting, the First National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities. A brief look at this symbolic gathering suggests that both churches and colleges have become aware of the decay in this apostolate. The Society was hardly alone in sensing decline, and noting others' concerns and reactions will give us a better grasp of our own problems.

Fourth: The Jesuits and Their Colleges. In spite of the fact that Project 1 now seems to many a crumbling mesa in a desert of neglect, the Assistancy actually made constant efforts to keep its mission on course. Understanding those efforts requires a look not only at the Jesuit Educational Association (JEA), the Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA), and the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU), but also at the broader work of renewal provoked by Vatican II and General Congregations

31 and 32. The structures for energizing the common mission fit tightly into the structures of the provinces' assemblies, the Jesuit National Leadership Project, and the Jesuit Conference.

A decade ago the efforts seemed to have failed, as a somewhat detailed look at the particulars of the apostolate in 1972 shows.

Fifth: The Jesuits and the AJCU: Reestablishing the Common Mission.

Like the Methodists, Lutherans, Benedictines, and Dominican Sisters, Jesuits felt that we had to reestablish something that had been deeply shaken. We did things similar to those done by others, but we were following our own way of proceeding. Thus, Project 1 was intended as an action-reflection process that would lead to redefined apostolic purposes. But the process itself became part of the outcome when the provincials assigned each community to figure out not only how it would pursue its mission but also what that mission is to be, and to keep giving consideration to that in community.¹³ The process of Project 1 was flawed, particularly in its deliberate detachment from the institutions, but the provincials accomplished something of what they had hoped for.

For the provincials accepted what consultation they could get and reached decisions that they continue to implement.

Sixth: First Steps in the Renewal. The response that the provincials had committed themselves to make to the communities' definitions of purpose ("rationales") is their Easter Letter of 1978 (printed below as an Appendix on pages 81-91). With this extraordinary letter they intended to end Project 1 and to formally begin our "national corporate apostolate" in higher education. They ask that their decisions be kept in mind not only by the twenty-eight communities but by men in formation and in other apostolates in education.¹⁴ They intended this document to frame the obediential context of work in higher education. It remains operative: On June 21, 1982, the provincials promulgated "Guidelines for the Assignment of Jesuit Personnel in Higher Education," an explicit fulfillment of their decision to give clear structure to the new relationships obtaining among provincials, administrators, and rectors.¹⁵ More significantly, the Easter Letter asks for continuing efforts to "develop the required predispositions and skills"

that will allow the communities to undertake their continuing apostolic planning "in the context of spiritual discernment."¹⁶

Conclusions: Jesuit Renewal and the Renewal of the Colleges. American Jesuits have produced a number of successful statements on Jesuit higher education and its realization in a particular institution, particularly during the last decade, so that task does not have to be addressed here. Rather, it may be possible to consider the connections between a Jesuit community's efforts to clarify its apostolic purposes and their institution's continuing labor of defining academic purposes. Musing on a related question, Jencks and Riesman speculate that the ablest Catholic educations will "feel obliged" to prove that Roman Catholicism can compete successfully with institutions on the Harvard-Berkeley model. The two authors hope that "having done this, a few may be able to do something more." The something more is "an American Catholic university that manages to fuse academic professionalism with concern for questions of ultimate social and moral importance." They believe that Catholic academicians will have to work at such a fusion, and they note that it was in this task that the Protestant colleges and universities failed. "Unless a few Catholic universities can do better, they too will be engulfed by academic professionalism," and grow secularized.¹⁷ Is it possible that the work of faith for justice, expressed in concrete matters for research and praxis, might supply the questions of ultimate social and moral importance?

PART I. THE CHURCHES AND THEIR COLLEGES

When the provincials launched Project 1 in February of 1973, we were embroiled in some of the most extensive changes in higher education in this century.¹⁸ We still had vivid images of shootings in May, 1970, at Jackson State and Kent State. Many of us were meeting long hours to revise the core curriculum or to set up new interdisciplinary majors.¹⁹ We were weary of Carnegie Commission reports and of tenure battles. We were rewriting statutes and handbooks, sitting on Senate committees with students, trying to get off the Standing Committee on Long-Range Planning, or hoping to get on the newly expanded Board of Trustees.

In those days we could easily confuse Project 1 with some further attempt at innovation in our colleges. As David O'Brien remarked, we seemed to be summoned to just one more tiresome, fruitless meeting.²⁰ But the Project never belonged directly in the context of educational reform.

Rather, Project 1 and the work we now do on our colleges' identities belong in the context of efforts by churches and church-related colleges and universities to reestablish the "common mission."²¹ We were mistaken not to have put Project 1 into that context early on, and in fact the Conference staff tried to do that in an early meeting in one of our universities. They met debate and dissension, so they dropped it.

It will be useful, therefore, to remember how much a part of the often turbulent history of church-related higher education in America our apostolic efforts have been.

Everyone knows, to begin at the very beginning, that the Puritans planted a place on the Charles River in 1636 where "Everyone shall consider the Mayne end of his life & Studyes to know God & Jesus Christ which is Eternall life."²² The Congregationalists of western Connecticut, having decided that instruction at Harvard was not fitting youth for much beyond heresy, founded Yale in 1701, "wherein youth may be instructed in the arts and sciences, who through the blessing of almighty God, may be fitted for public employment, both in church and civil state."²³ When the Baptists grew suspicious in 1767 of what both were teaching, they launched Brown University, the Episcopalians having founded King's College (Columbia University) in 1754, just in case.

The colonists were not energized solely by denominational rivalries, of course. As Jencks and Riesman argue, "ideological, ethnic, geographical, and class schisms" all furthered the "establishment of small, struggling, highly competitive Protestant colleges in every corner of the country."²⁴

Enthusiasm was enormous: Snively estimates that, of the first 120 colleges founded in our country, about 100 were founded by the churches.²⁵ Everyone's count differs: One scholar numbered 182 fairly successful colleges before the Civil War, of which 174 were religious.²⁶ A study published by the American Council on Education in 1966 says, somewhat more modestly, that of the 516 attempts at college foundations before the Civil War ended, most were under church sponsorship.²⁷ Not all of them lasted, of course; St. Charles College in Grand Coteau, Louisiana, was

opened twice as a college, became a novitiate, and is now a spirituality center.

The Congregationalists and Presbyterians led the way, quickly joined by the Baptists and Methodists and ultimately joined by just about every American denomination, north and south. Here is a list of half of the institutions with their sponsors established in Ohio before the Civil War: Franklin, Presbyterian; Western Reserve, Congregationalist; St. Xavier, Roman Catholic; Baldwin, Methodist; Wittenberg, Lutheran; Otterbein, United Brethren; Heidelberg, Reformed; Urbana, Swedenborgian; Antioch, Christian; Hiram, Disciples.²⁸

The denominations' reasons for establishing the colleges--while hardly uncomplicated by politics, ethnicity, geography, and economics--were clear, explicit, and the common possession of the colonists and then of the citizens. King's College, for instance, published an advertisement in 1754 which is altogether typical.

The chief Thing that is aimed at in this College, is, to teach and engage the Children to *know God in Jesus Christ*, to love and serve him in all *Sobriety, Godliness, and Richness* of Life, with a perfect Heart and a Willing Mind: and to train them up in all Virtuous Habits, and all such useful Knowledge as may render them creditable to their Families and Friends, Ornaments to their Country, and useful to the Public Weal in their generation.²⁹

Those aims were to be achieved by a curriculum and school policies modeled on Cambridge and Oxford, but with clear affinities to institutions still being founded in Europe: Münster (1631, Catholic); Innsbruck (1670, Catholic); and Halle (1694, Lutheran), which was founded the same year as William and Mary. That curriculum showed the same emphasis on theology as the organizing viewpoint that Ignatius insisted upon in Part IV of the *Constitutions*.³⁰ Queen's College (Rutgers University), for instance, was founded in 1776, "for the education of youth in the learned languages, liberal and useful arts and sciences, and especially in divinity, preparing them for the ministry and other good offices."³¹

Bishop John Carroll clearly expressed the same intention for the curriculum of Georgetown Academy just fifteen years later in his first pastoral letter. He wrote that the new college is to unite "much attention to religion with a solicitude for other improvements, the general result [being] a great increase of piety, the necessary consequences of a careful instruction in the principles of faith, and Christian morality."³²

Enthusiasm was so high before the Civil War that Emerson once complained of hearing the rustle of a college plan in the pocket of every man he passed on the Common. The denominations had, by one count, 250 institutions in operation when the War ended, and they went right on founding new ones in just about every state. For instance: The American Missionary Society founded Fisk College in Tennessee in 1865; the Congregationalists, Carleton in Minnesota in 1866; the Baptists, Morehouse College in Georgia in 1867; the Methodists, Union College in Kentucky in 1879; the Presbyterians, Occidental College in California in 1887; the Seventh-Day Adventists, Oakwood College in Alabama in 1896--all still healthy institutions, though not all on equally intimate terms with their founding churches.³³

Of course, Catholics joined this fervent founding from the time they were able to do so.³⁴ Schooling in the Maryland Counties before the Revolutionary War is not well documented, so the founding of Georgetown in 1789 and of the Visitation Convent of Georgetown in 1799 begins our recorded history. But we have no adequate history of these foundations, and not even a sure count. Power is able to list 87 before the Civil War.³⁵ Each institution has its unique story, but there are patterns. At the beginning, a rather larger percentage were founded by the dioceses than were later on, though all along the great majority of them were founded by religious congregations and orders--almost like denominations.

Bishop John England, for instance, had a flourishing institution in Charleston, South Carolina, from 1822 to 1842. Jesuits who were later to remove to Fordham in 1846 had accepted St. Mary's College in Kentucky, which had been conducted by the diocese from 1821 to 1831. More than one college was begun as a seminary: St. Mary's of Baltimore, for instance, begun by the Sulpicians in 1799, and Washington Seminary, begun in 1821 by the Jesuits and later on run for some years as Gonzaga College. St. Mary's College, New Jersey, chartered in 1847, was actually a parish school which offered college courses during a couple of decades.³⁶

The religious congregations and orders founded most of the lasting institutions, slowly before the Civil War, and more quickly after it. Among the foundations: the Congregation of the Resurrection, St. Mary's College in Kentucky in 1821; the Augustinian Fathers, Villanova in Pennsylvania in 1842; the Congregation of the Holy Cross, Notre Dame in Indiana in 1842; the Society of St. Mary, St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas, in 1852;

the Franciscans, Quincy College in Illinois in 1860; the Benedictines, St. John's University in Minnesota in 1857 and Belmont Abbey College in North Carolina in 1878; the Premonstratensians, St. Norbert's College in Wisconsin in 1898.

Congregations of women may have founded rather more colleges than the men. After the Visitation Convent, for example, the Sisters of Charity (St. Vincent de Paul) founded St. Joseph's College at Emmetsburg in Maryland in 1809; Sisters of Charity (Nazareth), Nazareth College in Kentucky in 1814; Sisters of Providence, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College in Indiana in 1840; Sisters of Charity (Blessed Virgin Mary), Mt. St. Joseph's College in Dubuque, Iowa, in 1843; Sisters of Mercy, St. Francis Xavier College for Women in Chicago in 1846; Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, College of the Holy Names in California in 1868.³⁷

The Jesuits played an influential role in the formation of Catholic higher education in America. Their numbers alone are impressive: Jesuits ran 13 of the 28 Catholic colleges open in 1850; 19 of the 60 open in 1866; and 26 of the 84 colleges surveyed in 1916.³⁸ But according to more than one historian, Jesuits played "the preeminent role" in forming curriculum and collegiate organization.³⁹ The Georgetown curriculum, reshaped according to the new *Ratio* promulgated *ad experimentum* by Father General Roothaan in 1832, "served as a model curriculum for Catholic higher education until the first decade of the twentieth century."⁴⁰

Catholic purposes seem very much the same as those of the denominations. Merle Curti, Charles and Mary Beard, and Samuel Eliot Morison might debate the fine points, but Lutherans, Jesuits, the Friends, the Ursulines, all opened their schools to deepen the religious commitment of the young while giving them a higher education that would allow success in society without truckling to the forces of irreligion, however those forces were idiosyncratically defined at a given time.

We are beginning to see that Catholics were driven by the same ideological, ethnic, geographical, and class schisms as Protestants suffered, and were no more able to reduce higher education to rational planning. When we had no more than two institutions, for instance, Bishops John Carroll and Leonard Neale squared off as antagonists in an acrimonious battle over opening a collegiate program at St. Mary's of Baltimore, which was supposed to be a seminary, and the development of courses of philosophy at Georgetown

Academy, which was supposed to be a college.⁴¹ The dioceses and the religious congregations were as enthusiastic and as anarchic in launching schools as were the denominations.

We have to remember, however, that as Catholics opened colleges, they faced what Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., considered "the deepest bias in the history of the American people--anti-Catholicism."⁴² That external pressure went far toward keeping our colleges religious and toward maintaining the curricular tradition established at Georgetown in 1835 long after Protestant colleges had dropped the curricular orientations of the Yale Report of 1847. Consequently, Jesuit students were hic-haec-hocing and pounding away at casuistry, metaphysics, and Thomistic faculty psychology decades after the education of Henry Adams had been abandoned. Nothing galvanizes purpose like a state of siege.

Anti-Catholicism, particularly virulent during the 1890s, the 1920s, and again in the 1950s, and American Catholic ultramontaniam, the result of the Americanist and the Modernist controversies, conspired together to keep Catholic higher education from inculturating at a more controllable pace than the tongue-lolling dogtrot of the past three decades. These social forces insured that Catholic higher education would serve the social, political, religious, and economic purposes of Catholics as if in an alien land.

Of course, from the beginning all church-related colleges played a central role in the social, political, and economic life of the colonies and then of the states. Early student rosters were sometimes drawn up, not in alphabetical or academic order, but by social standing. Their alumni played key roles in the American Revolution: John Adams and James Madison, for instance. The fact is that every college was founded in the belief expressed by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.⁴³

The churches' colleges, when they talked about making their graduates creditable to their families and ornaments of society, were paraphrasing a statement of Thomas Jefferson's, who claimed:

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves. And if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a

wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion.⁴⁴

But this service rendered to society was not a secular function in the minds of men who believed that religion was woven in the fabric of civil life.⁴⁵ So Lyman Beecher could insist, as he did in 1836, that it was up to the churches' colleges "to break up and diffuse among the people that monopoly of knowledge and mental power which despotic governments accumulate for the purpose of arbitrary rule"; but this same Beecher insisted with all his heart that the function of the colleges was to Christianize.⁴⁶ During his lifetime, any mob was thought of as simultaneously ignorant and immoral, and any college that did not enjoy a "refreshing" of religion or an outright awakening during a given undergraduate's career was considered to be failing in its purpose.⁴⁷ The colleges, in fact, were important in both religious awakenings and reform movements (which often grew out of the awakenings) during the first half of the nineteenth century. The Civil War seems to have changed that, but even after the fervor of awakenings moved away from education and onto the stages in the cities during the Moody-Sankey revivals of the 1880s and 1890s, the colleges still required religious participation as well as religious instruction, even the most "secularized" of them. Harvard, for instance, did not drop required chapel until 1886 and Columbia, until 1891. The University of Detroit, in its first catalogue in 1885, required all Catholic students to be present at Mass at 8:30 in the morning, which seems to have been the rule in Catholic institutions.⁴⁸

After the Civil War, many colleges were losing contact with the "common mission" they had shared with the churches, but many others kept that purpose clear and well-established in the curriculum and discipline. Seattle College's catalogue statement of 1901 seems typical:

Seattle College is under the sole and exclusive control of the Members of the Society of Jesus. . . . It is their mission to form men of deep thought, solid principles, virtuous habits, and of sound religious convictions, without which they deem education little better than worthless.⁴⁹

They also began the school day at 8:30 with Mass.

This religious emphasis was of course not new, and in particular it was not the product of the evangelical conservatism renascent in the last quarter of the nineteenth century that would nourish what we now call fundamentalism and launch yet another series of institutions that we call "Bible colleges."⁵⁰ But as the common mission had been shaped variously in

past decades, it took new shapes in the early twentieth century when "most Boards called for the study of the Bible, and of the Christian religion, and placed an emphasis on the training of Christian character as well as on the pursuit of truth in a spirit of freedom."⁵¹ In its *Annual Report* of 1926, the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was speaking the language of the time when it declared "the development and culture of Christian character as the supreme end of all academic influence."⁵²

The church-related colleges did not get from 1636 to 1926 without a considerable number of storms.

In the 1790s, as an example, the colleges had to wrestle with a vogue in French free-thinking. Tricolor boutonnieres then provoked the same sinking anger that the peace symbol provoked in the mid-1960s. Again, during the Jacksonian Era, the colleges confronted the student literary-society movement. A kind of counterculture to the frozen curriculum, the movement produced a pair of competing societies on each campus, each with its own library. At Oberlin in 1862 the college owned 6,000 volumes and the students, 3,000--and the students tended to acknowledge no book as forbidden. The societies' readings, writings, and debating furthered great freedom. And to this, students then added the free inquiry and the impatience with "the dead hand of the past" typical of American Transcendentalism.

In the 1870s, the colleges faced the challenge of the Greek-letter fraternities. No one had any problems with the scholarly Phi Beta Kappa (1776). But the Union Triad, organized in the 1820s for purely social purposes, had dragged the colleges into the secret-society imbroglio. After the Civil War, social fraternities spread rapidly, causing difficulties because of their elitism and their bacchanalian propensities.⁵³ But the fraternities' greatest challenge to the colleges was their basic commitment to worldly success, which Frederick Rudolph argues they conceived over against the moral and religious ideals of the colleges. Their secrecy, pseudo-Greek ideals, quasi-Freemasonic practices appeared to put them in direct conflict with the common mission of church-related higher education.⁵⁴

We might have had some experience of how this challenge invaded the campuses if we can remember the flower children suddenly sprouting up on our earnest, buttoned-down campuses in the 1960s, ambling around in cut-off jeans, long-haired, bearded or bra-less, holding in the smoke of funny little

brown cigarettes, and tossing up "Oh, wow's!" like agitated rock doves. In the 1870s, it was a secret handshake and rum in the fruit punch; and they all married, financed homes, and became vested businessmen, too.

Even aside from curricular problems--like the ones implied in St. Louis University's notice of 1879 that students will be received into the Preparatory Department "provided they know how to read and are not under 10 years old"--other pressures worked against the common mission in the colleges.⁵⁵ Student housing, for instance, was an on-again, off-again affair, with corresponding impact on the atmosphere of the institutions. Simple competition between institutions for manpower and money has also eroded purpose, as seems to have been the case with the Jesuits' St. John's Literary Institute in Frederick City, Maryland, which for a time rivaled Georgetown. St. John's problems might have been murkier, though; the administrators expelled a number of students suddenly on unspoken grounds and the college never recovered.

Then, the economic depressions like the ones in the 1890s and the 1930s forced the colleges to accommodate their purposes in order to keep their doors open. Popular approval of collegiate education also waxed and waned: For a time after the Civil War, enrollments dropped off seriously, closing colleges like the Dominican St. Joseph's in Ohio. And when public interest grew, it opened colleges, like Fairfield (1942) and the University of Dallas (1946).

Many larger movements in American social and intellectual history were sea-changes in the latitudes traversed by a four-year curriculum, changing its course notably but imperceptibly. The abolition movement, among many others, had deep impact on institutions like Oberlin (on the Ohio just across from Kentucky), whose student body was led in a rebellion by Theodore Weld and whose Board overreacted and undermined the authority of President Lyman Beecher, who ultimately resigned. The movement toward professional schooling during the 1870s and 1880s is another instance: Commercial, legal, and medical institutes not infrequently ended as parts of the academic structure of the colleges, as Milwaukee's Medical College ended at Marquette. As the century ended, progressivism had its impact on education, as had the Social Gospel.

PART II. THE AMERICANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By 1900 five developments had elicited deep adjustments from church-related colleges. Perhaps merely aspects of the same organic growth, they are worth noting in detail because they shaped Jesuit institutions. They are service as an ideal, electivism, professionalism, curricular evolution, and what I shall call "laicization."

A. Service

That some kind of service to society was education's aim from the beginning is clear from prospectuses like Columbia's and Georgetown's, all of which mention that the college not only forms youth in virtue but also makes them useful to the commonweal. But for the first century and a half, the colleges' service was to give what everyone understood as "an education," and what everyone agreed was the only education. Such service could be offered only through a tiny elite and looked more otiose as the nineteenth century wore on. Then other agenda, other curricula, began to look like real education. Commercial programs--one author called them "English and business forms"--had been offered very early, sometimes from the founding of schools like Notre Dame, Villanova, and even The College of the Holy Cross, though the Jesuit provincial considered the program "humbugging, but *ne quid nimis*."⁵⁶ The colleges did not consider it proper education; the program, for instance, was completely separated at St. Louis in 1858, teachers, students, and classrooms. If they recognized its completion at all, the colleges commonly awarded some kind of certificate--not a degree. But pressure mounted as business and technology employed more and more men and women, so that by 1910 the commercial course had become respectable enough to be honored with a degree in many places, larded, of course, with considerable rhetoric about teaching moral principles and establishing men in their faith and conveying the unifying vision of Christian philosophy.

This same development was paralleled by scientific studies, which at first merely took the place of Greek and then of Latin, but eventually took the place of the liberal-studies curriculum.

Developments at colleges like Detroit's were typical, where the Scientific Department had been formally introduced in the 1879-1880 bulletin: "It will embrace in addition to the usual branches of an English

education, the study of Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics, Mechanics and Astronomy."⁵⁷ In the very next bulletin, the Commercial Department was introduced.

Was the classical liberal education the only, or the best, way to serve Americans? As early as 1887 the Central Committee on Studies in the Missouri Province was showing a shift in the way American Jesuits thought they could serve:

Though the Society is not adverse to special schools where they are needed, it is not her object in establishing colleges to turn out specialists, but to develop all the mental and moral faculties of the students by means of a liberal education.⁵⁸

Developing "mental and moral faculties" is not quite the same as developing *eloquentia perfecta*, which marks one shift, and by 1900 a further conviction had deepened that it should be possible to "develop all the mental and moral faculties" of a student by means other than the classical liberal education, giving him some practical education at the same time, as a service. So Frederick Rudolph argues about the last decades of the nineteenth century:

Cornell initially moved the definition of the American University away from the dominant research interest that characterized the universities of Germany toward an emphasis on service to the material and moral aspirations of the middle class. . . . [Cornell's was] an educational philosophy that helped poor but energetic young men and women to get rich.⁵⁹

Consequently, Boyer and Hechinger correctly conclude, "institutions once primarily devoted to teaching, and later to research, added *service* as a third important mission"--a service that was not rendered by the liberal arts curriculum.⁶⁰

In the universities this move to a new kind of service was merely an extension of empirical research and professional training, as scholars in medicine, business, engineering, and agronomy applied their science and trained their students.

In the colleges the addition of service as a secular mission or as a vehicle to convey the common mission resulted in the multiplication of programs and degrees further and further removed from the liberal studies that had been the vehicle of the common mission for centuries. By the middle of the century, Robert I. Gannon grumbled that "even at Fordham there were financial wizards to whom a university was just another grocery store"

where a student could find whatever he (or, just at this time, she) wanted.⁶¹ Then came the explosion of the 1960s into what Boyer and Hechinger sardonically call "the academic supermarket."⁶²

When growth shifted to decline around 1970, another result of the service commitment emerged. The colleges needed students for their many programs and the student pool was shrinking. So they switched from admitting students either selectively or at least according to some principle to recruiting them aggressively, "going from buying to selling in the student market."⁶³ They also began programs for the simple reason that they could find students to people them. By 1983 one Jesuit university's long-range planning committee considered its work in terms of reallocating financial resources to those programs which were marketable.

Now these developments are not insoluble educational problems, but when an institution sets itself to do whatever a locale needs done and whatever will bring it students and funds, it can betray its purpose. A church-related institution runs an obviously higher risk here of abandoning its common mission in the scramble merely to survive as a college. The practice of this kind of service by Jesuit institutions furthered a misconception about the Jesuit mission in education that our schools "did not result from a *policy* of the Society; they arose out of the felt needs of the church in particular areas."⁶⁴ This error arose "with some frequency around the Assistancy" during the national consultation of Project 1, and it indicates that even Jesuits--very many of whom were getting or had gotten the professional training to give this new service--were confused about why the Society had come to this country of higher education in the first place.

Catholic colleges faced a further complication with service that Protestant colleges did not face, for from the start the service they offered was conditioned by life in the ghetto. While a Notre Dame was training a man in chemistry and a Villanova, in the sound practices of accounting in the 1890s; and while Seattle College was training a woman to nurse and Boston College, a man to practice the law in the 1920s, everyone understood that the colleges were giving another education within and beyond the "practical," a perennial education quite free of society's anti-Catholic biases and errors--and utterly impervious to its consumer's suspect whims. By producing first-rate chemists, lawyers, and doctors who were faithful Catholics, these institutions were "proving" the validity of Catholicism

and doing a service to Catholics as progress-oriented Americans. Their service was postulated on anti-Catholicism.

One element in the growing loss of purpose in Catholic higher education in the 1950s and 1960s, we should note now, was the disappearance of the need for this specific service when anti-Catholicism lost its gross force. After the Kennedy election and after the ambiguous patriotisms of Vietnam, Catholics simply no longer had to show anyone that we were 110 percent American. If it really made no difference one way or another to anyone whether businessmen, dental hygienists, journalists, lawyers, and engineers were Catholic--not even to themselves--then why were the Catholic colleges and universities still in business, since that training is what they seemed to be for? We know the lassitude of the ship's crew when the storm is truly past.

By the time the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1973, the ideal of service to the commonweal was itself seriously eroded throughout higher education. As Boyer and Hechinger point out, service reached an acme of sorts when the presidents of Harvard and M.I.T. went to President Roosevelt to place all the resources of higher education at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief.⁶⁵ "The universities and the state had joined in common cause," Boyer and Hechinger claim. But that common cause was grievously damaged during the Vietnam era, and the time of visible, prestigious service by higher education, whose shape and substance was dictated by the nation's needs and dreams, ended roughly with the 1960s. Educators have known that higher education no longer has a clear and urgent mission from society at large.⁶⁶ If they read between the cliché-larded lines of the *Time* essay, "Five Ways to Wisdom," they heard the middlemind of America telling them to do nothing about their academic and intellectual fragmentation that would interfere with the excellent job-training they are currently giving.⁶⁷ It is not much of a mission.

B. The Elective System

In 1800 the only election that could possibly be made by a student was whether to go to college or not. That was changed by the "elective system" promoted by Henry Tappan at the University of Michigan in 1855.⁶⁸ Tappan had introduced choice within degree programs--"parallel courses" to the baccalaureate. But as the nineteenth century ended, others gradually pushed

election into the entire curriculum. One group of colleges, led by Harvard under Charles W. Eliot (the college's first nonminister president), made everything elective. A second group, including Columbia and Princeton, made half of the curriculum required and left half to election. A third group, led by the University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin, divided courses into major and minor concentrations and called on the student to choose a major only after two full years of exploratory study. A final group, led by John Hopkins, divided studies into areas and required that students take most of their courses in one area. These were the institutions which changed to the elective system.

Church-related colleges were much slower, convinced as they were that the liberal-studies curriculum embodied perfectly their education and religious purposes. But as they would be more or less forced to conform to accreditation and the credit system, so they were pushed into electivism. Jesuit institutions, and most Catholic institutions with them, maintained a "core curriculum" that was meant to embody the liberal education and attain religious purposes in the curriculum. Until very recently, only Jesuits taught philosophy and theology in Jesuit colleges, and Jesuits were from time to time prohibited from teaching other subjects such as accounting, which was one way of stressing what our colleges considered the heart of their education.

The ploy was of limited value. In 1928 John LaFarge complained that "The great multiplicity of subjects and courses offered to the student is objected to as lacking coordination with any organic idea of the whole purpose of study."⁶⁹ By 1941 Robert Gannon was hardly alone in his fear "that the liberal arts were done for."⁷⁰ With them went the clear curricular embodiment of the "common mission" of church and college. Colleges found it more and more difficult to identify a plausible unifying vision and could not have been overjoyed at the Harvard faculty's famous pronouncement in 1945 that "whatever one's views, religion is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity."⁷¹ The implication was that perhaps religion might unite a handful of backward institutions, but "belief in the worth and meaning of the human spirit" is what unifies the mainstream of higher education.

The significance of the elective system in the development of church-related colleges is not on the surface. Brubacher argues that the debates

ultimately involved every significant education issue in the nineteenth century: German vs. English ideals, faculty psychology vs. experimental psychology, external governance vs. the new self-motivation movements, practical vs. liberal learning.⁷² He concludes that the conflict grew because educators began to doubt whether "mental discipline"--the mainstay of educational ideology as late as the 1870s--was truly feasible. More significantly to this essay, he concludes that the fundamental question underlying the elective-system struggle was this: "Should college be predominantly secular or religious in orientation?"⁷³

C. Professionalism

As I understand the matter, the colleges turned to professionalism in two ways. First, they turned research, once the natural adjunct of the profession of teaching, into a profession on its own. Second, they incorporated into their curriculum law, medicine, metallurgy, and other professions.

The commitment to research as an ideal spread in academe as empiricism deepened and positivism was reaching maturity. It required that the faculty adopt the researcher's primary loyalty to the norms and standards of his own profession, and inexorably moved them into narrow, specialized fields. This professionalism made conflicts between researchers' conclusions and institutions' doctrinal loyalties all but inevitable, and it is the rich ground from which grew the American Association of University Professors in 1915. Of course, from it grew graduate studies.

This professionalism began in American higher education at the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, when men like historian George Bancroft came back from Göttingen University, followed by a growing number from Halle, Leipzig, Munich, and Berlin (where Cornell's Andrew D. White had studied). The first doctorate given in America was awarded at Yale in 1861, and the college organized graduate studies a decade later, followed closely by Harvard and Georgetown. Then, in 1876, Johns Hopkins was founded professedly to duplicate the academic purposes and practices of the German universities. Others like it were quickly founded: Stanford (1885), the University of Chicago (1890), and Clark (1887), all sprung full-panoplied from a great fortune. Many of the best-established four-year colleges developed their graduate programs into graduate schools, as did Columbia,

Harvard, and the Universities of Pennsylvania and Michigan.

Catholic institutions had been granting occasional graduate degrees, but without any formal programs. Georgetown University started organizing its programs during the 1870s, and in 1891 inaugurated a complete, planned program for the earned doctorate.⁷⁴ Catholic University opened theology instruction aimed at a doctorate in 1889, and added philosophy and social studies in 1895. This addition of graduate schools raised numerous tensions in church-related colleges. Principal among those tensions is that between the handed-down body of knowledge thought to explain all human experience, at least potentially, and a method of inquiry that postulates the absence of any set explanations. In its various permutations, this is the question Jencks and Riesman believe Catholic universities face today, and it is the matter of the debate carried on during the decades after World War II in *America*, the *NCEA Bulletin*, *Catholic World*, and *Commonweal* by the likes of Neil G. McCloskey, Philip Gleason, Thomas F. O'Dea, John D. Donovan, and John Tracy Ellis.

The second professionalism came more visibly. Until well into the nineteenth century, instruction in the liberal arts was an adequate preparation for most professions, and what else needed to be learned could be got through apprenticeships, like reading law or assisting a surgeon. But the Enlightenment had made more things scientific than George Washington's attitude toward farming, and the government began taking steps to regulate Americans' exuberant quackery and charlatanry. So institutes and schools emerged for instruction in medicine, law, engineering, dentistry, and much else. Few of them enjoyed any reputation and very few deserved any. As the century ran on, on the initiative now of one partner and now of another, the institutes and the colleges began to get together. Sometimes a college began training in law or medicine by organizing a faculty, sometimes by absorbing independent academies. Toward the end of the century, these professionals began more serious dedication to research and to scientific method.

For instance, Georgetown accepted the request of four medical doctors to constitute its medical department in 1849. Then, in the 1890s, it took dramatic steps to improve scientific instruction by dropping the evening course, lengthening the program from two to four years, and equipping extensive laboratories in response to a new emphasis on research. Or again,

in 1903, St. Louis University went into medical education (for the second time) by incorporating two medical colleges.

The range of this professionalism was vastly widened by the famous Morrill Act of 1862, which gave the states 30,000 acres of federal land for each Congressman, to endow or support institutions of agricultural or mechanical arts. Added legislation supplied further funding, and most of the states enriched their universities with a new set of courses and departments. Some, however, launched the "A & M" colleges, and some further endowed private institutions. Massachusetts, for instance, directed its money to the new Institute of Technology and New York, to the new Cornell University. The latter is significant because it marks the adoption by a private institution of the dual professionalism emerging in the late nineteenth century and because Cornell was a much-admired bellwether. John Adams had written in 1780 that he had to study politics so that his grandchildren could study painting and music and architecture, certainly not imagining that they would do it in a university far above Cayuga's waters, which in his day were in a howling wilderness.

Many states, like Iowa and Oregon, set up independent A & M colleges with the Morrill Act money, which had so deep an impact on farming that Morison and Commager treat the matter in a section called "Scientific Agriculture."⁷⁵ They provoked enormous popular interest in postsecondary education in places where, in the popular imagination, the buffalo still roam and the deer and the antelope play, and even where the great cattle drives up the Cimarron and Old Chisholm Trails left dust on school windowsills. For decades, the establishment was contemptuous toward these "cow colleges."

Education is the rage
in Wisconsin
Everyone is wise and sage
in Wisconsin
Every newsboy that you see
Has a varsity degree
Every cook's a Ph.D.
in Wisconsin.⁷⁶

The two professionalisms together brought slow but sweeping reorganizations. They introduced what William James sardonically called in 1903 the "Mandarin disease," the professional doctorate. They swept faculties into departments during the 1890s, then into schools and finally, in the 1920s,

into colleges--too often connected by little more than steam conduits and an interest in parking spaces (as President Kerr said of the University of California at Berkeley). The professionalism meant the dispersion of the liberal-studies faculties into separate camps, whose loyalty to their own cohort was deeper than their dedication to the institution's common purposes. The consequences of such professionalism are visible. Marquette, for instance, absorbed the Milwaukee Medical College (medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing) in stages between 1903 and 1907, then in less than twenty years added these: Law (1907), Engineering (1908), Business (1909), Journalism (1910, the first in the country), Music (1911), Graduate School (1922), Speech (1926, also the first), and School of Hospital Administration (1925, first in the world).⁷⁷

By 1924, of the 25 Jesuit colleges and universities, 10 had schools of commerce and business; 6, of dentistry; 8, of education; 3, of engineering; 1 of foreign service; 13, of law; 5, of medicine; 3, of pharmacy; and 3, of social work.⁷⁸ Steadily, of course, these institutions claimed that their principal *raison d'etre* was the Christian education of the whole person. The rhetoric changed between the Civil War and World War II, but the substance was firmly and intelligently sustained.

To an age whose education was secular, scientific, and technical in spirit, particularized in vision, flexible in approach, vocational in aim, and democratic in social orientation, the Jesuits thus opposed a system that was religious, literary, and humanistic in spirit, synthetic in vision, rigid in approach, liberal in aim, and elitist in social orientation.⁷⁹

D. Excursus on the Curriculum

For a century and a half, Jesuits maintained that religious, literary, humanistic, liberal education precisely by being "rigid in approach." The men who invented American Jesuit curricula had had their own education in every nation in Europe and were still coming when the New Immigration hit the Mauve Decade like a tidal wave. Hence they welcomed the new *Ratio studiorum*, wanted the Georgetown curriculum of 1835 to succeed, and were unremitting in pushing it. Matthew G. Sullivan studied catalogues and bulletins and contends that in 1854-1855 the six Jesuit colleges whose records exist had a curriculum "strictly classical" that ran six to eight years.⁸⁰ He found that the eleven colleges running in 1879-1880 had made

"little change" in that classical curriculum except to include four years of elocution and oratory, reflecting the vogue of platform oratory probably as much as a dedication to *eloquentia perfecta*, which has a broader meaning than elocution. By 1879, however, the lament written by a Father Walter Hill of St. Louis was a national chorus.

Latin and Greek, it is said, are of no use in business or mechanics; it is a waste of time to apply them; give us the substantial parts of a good business education, or of science, such as mathematics, chemistry, and others, out of which a man can draw a livelihood: as if education had no end in view beyond dollars and cents, or comfort and good living. But it is useless to refute such notions.⁸¹

Jesuits only half-believed it useless, so even as they opened commercial courses, they did everything possible to keep the much-adapted *Ratio* curriculum alive. Even in 1904-1905, Sullivan contends, the seventeen colleges were "still strictly classical," though he has some changes to report: English literature has somewhat supplanted classical literature, mathematics is taught as much as four years, and for the first time, religion (four years) and philosophy (one or two years) appear in the curriculum.

By 1900 many colleges had adopted "the St. Louis Plan," reorganizing the six-year sequence into four years each of high school and of college.⁸² They had to do this partially because Jesuit college degrees were being treated as high school certificates. Thus, Timothy Bouscaren, the great canon lawyer, went in 1902 from six years at St. Xavier College to Yale University, where in 1906 he received a B.A. For the truth is that as this century began, Jesuit colleges managed to be what Columbia had been in 1876, "a small, old-fashioned college, or rather school, for teaching Latin, Greek, mathematics and a little metaphysics, and a very little natural science."⁸³ Columbia (which had gone only partially elective) dropped Greek in 1897 from its B.A. requirements, dropped Latin from its scientific course in 1905, and dropped Latin altogether in 1916.⁸⁴ Jesuit colleges held out much longer: Andrew Smith reported to the JEA in 1948 that Latin was required for the B.A. in all twenty-seven Jesuit institutions.⁸⁵

However, that is only part of the story. For by the time Regis College, last to separate high school and collegiate programs, made its move in 1921, most of the other Jesuit colleges had already introduced concurrent bachelor's degrees--that is, curricula with no Latin--in science, commerce, and even "letters." Sullivan remarks that these curricula are "in full bloom" in

1929-1930, and that in them "integration through Latin, Greek, and English is often missing."⁸⁶ Students were unfeelingly flocking to these unintegrated curricula: Julian Maline recorded that during academic year 1954-1955 these percentages of students were taking the B.A. with its Latin requirement--now a fossil of 10 to 18 credit hours: New England, 30 percent; New York, 16 percent; New Orleans, 7.7 percent--and so on down through Chicago-Detroit, Maryland, Missouri-Wisconsin, California, to Oregon's 1.3 percent. The rest specialized Latinless.

The Jesuit deans, in their meeting at Santa Clara in 1955, resolved to ask the provincials to get the authority from the general for each province to drop the Latin B.A. at its own discretion.⁸⁷ Their discussion indicates simply that they saw Latin as an obstacle, which it surely was. They might reasonably have argued that the requirement was a relic of European intellectual imperialism that blocked American Jesuits, even as they created the *hegemon* among Catholic education systems, from making their appropriate contribution to the development of education within the Society and within the United States. The deans were forced to give a place of honor to a degree whose vehicle was a stone wheel. They could not have improved on Robert Maynard Hutchins's peevish contention:

By the end of the first quarter of this century, great books and the liberal arts had been destroyed by their teachers. The books had become the private domain of scholars. The word "classics" came to be limited to those works which were written in Greek and Latin . . . and a student might attend courses in Plato and Lucretius for years without discovering that they had any ideas. . . . [Professors'] reply to criticism and revolt was to demand, forgetting that interest is an essential in education, that their courses be required.⁸⁸

By the time Jesuit colleges dropped the Latin B.A., of course, they had in place the required core curriculum, for as they had incorporated professional education, Jesuits had implemented their intention to "humanize" these studies by themselves teaching moral theology and philosophy and gradually adding other humanities. Note in passing that the provincials' current wish that "in professional training, it should be of special concern to Jesuits that . . . the resources of the Catholic tradition in the humanities, philosophy, and theology be brought to bear" is not due to Vatican II or the Rome Synod of 1971.⁸⁹ On the contrary: As this century began, Jesuits were working into the curriculum a format that was explained by a committee on the major and minor in 1920:

According to the *Ratio Studiorum*, Latin was the major in the lower schools, *Philosophy* the major in the higher schools. The other studies were minors.⁹⁰

The combined result of paring down Latin, introducing mathematics and science, substituting modern languages for Greek and then for Latin, and adding "religion" and history emerges in the core curriculum that Maline described in 1955 after a survey of the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities: Philosophy, 15 to 28 hours; Theology, 8 to 16; English, 12; Speech, 2; Modern Foreign Languages, 12-16; Mathematics, 6-12; Science, 8 (there were some trade-offs between mathematics and sciences); History, 6 to 12. In most of our institutions, that left little to election, even in the major concentration. Marquette allowed 63 hours for the major and electives; John Carroll and U.S.F., 54; but they were out of line with most, which allowed many fewer: Loyola of Baltimore, for instance, and LeMoyne allowed 24.^{90a} During the 1960s, the 60- and 70-hour core curriculum was eroded. I remember that in 1970 Loyola of the South had one of the most extensive core curricula with a total requirement of about 54 hours. And the erosion continued, both in the size of the core curriculum and in its rational organization.

About this point it can be objected reasonably that the curriculum is not everything. For what Douglas Heath discovered of Haverford College in 1968 is really a commonplace of every college: that its real education may seem to be given solely by the curriculum, but "a more profound influence is made by the character and life of the college itself."⁹¹ Heath found that students and alumni considered the college's great strength "its insistence that the students integrate both the intellectual and the moral components of their education," an insistence not imposed by ukase but just "part of the total college environment." Mayhew and Ford discovered the same things in student testimony about "institutions as varied as Stanford, Antioch, Michigan State, Harvard, and Cornell."⁹² In fact, they discovered that the students themselves "do not assign a high value to the curriculum as such." Critics of Catholic higher education began to notice in the mid-1950s that this total college environment was a crucial element in the scholarly standards of an institution. Just as Douglas Heath was validating the commonplace about atmosphere for Haverford, Robert Weiss was trying to find out whether Catholic colleges manifested anything special in atmosphere.⁹³

He came late with that question, for by 1968 Catholics were facing the critical challenge posed four years earlier by John Donovan this way: "How can the Catholic college realize its intellectual goals, and at the same time function within the separate and different structures of religious and professional authority?"⁹⁴ In past decades the answer had been direct if not simple: Catholic colleges were conducted by men and women who themselves played the roles both of professional and of religious. Thus, while Yale University had offered Timothy Bouscaren professors given to scholarship and holding "absolute norms," St. Xavier had given him a cherished relationship with Jesuit teachers characterized by "spiritual influence, personal friendship, and broad mental training."⁹⁵

By the end of the 1960s, half a century after Bouscaren's experiences, the professors' roles had changed in critical ways through the process of "laicization."

E. Laicization

We use the term "lay" uniquely to oppose "cleric," but it has much broader senses. Two of them are pertinent here.

1. The Nonprofessing Professor

After pointing out that "lay" means noncleric, the dictionary records this use: "not belonging to or connected with a given profession." Now in the first instance, the "profession" in point here is the religious profession of the college's sponsoring church or denomination. In 1900 Brigham Young was staffed by professing Mormons; Augsburg, by Lutherans; and St. Mary's Dominican and Spring Hill College by appropriate Catholics. In this context, "lay person" would be any faculty member or administrator whose religious profession was other than the college's. Hence, since Yale and William and Mary were staffed indifferently in 1900 by Congregationalists, Episcopalians, or whatever, those institutions had been "laicized." Obviously this laicization is the principal way any church-related college comes to be secular, since its faculty and administration become indifferent to its common mission. This was the long historical shift that the great church historian Winthrop Hudson calls "the relinquishment by the churches of any sense of responsibility for the intellectual life."⁹⁶

For a century and a half and more, Catholics staffed Catholic

institutions. More than that, religious men and women and priests formed the cadre of every Catholic college. These religious gave specific shape to the educational tradition of the colleges, even during the decades when they were hiring more and more lay faculty. For, as Raphael Hamilton astutely remarks, the lay teacher was until very recently "more a technical assistant than a full-fledged member of the faculty." The religious governing the colleges managed that until the faculty-rights movement of the 1950s because when they joined professional schools to their colleges, they "did not unite their faculties."⁹⁷

In this way, each congregation and order had its own education tradition, its own peculiar academic and formational atmosphere. Jesuits, Marists, School Sisters of Notre Dame, the Religious of the Sacred Heart and the rest ran their colleges and their systems--commonly as large as those sponsored by denominations--in their own way, keeping final authority within the congregation or order. Whereas the Protestant bishops or synods or executives regularly appointed college-board members or presidents, set behavioral standards, and gave sound financial support to their colleges, the Catholic bishop's oversight was often embodied in--not symbolized by--his portrait on the foyer wall. The problems of each of these congregations and orders, therefore, are the same problems as were faced by the Protestant denominations in higher education, including the problems of being divided into synods and provinces and the problem of finding a continual supply of professing members to form the faculty. This led to a second kind of laicization.

2. The Uninitiated Professor

If "lay" means "not belonging to or connected with a given profession," in Catholic higher education that profession meant religious profession in a given congregation or order. As long as the Augustinians or the Basilians could find members of their own congregations to staff their colleges, their education tradition stayed intact. But adequate staff was a problem generally even before a college was founded, and some foresaw this: "All the teachers, if possible, should be members of the Society, although there may be others according to necessity."⁹⁸ Georgetown faced that need early for a fencing instructor and a teacher of penmanship; the Jesuits who moved into St. Xavier's College in 1840--they were eight, three of whom were priests--were immediately joined by some seminarians of the Cincinnati

diocese. Later in the century St. Mary's College (the University of Dayton) staffed its commercial and engineering departments with laymen. Seattle College lists twelve faculty and staff in its catalogue for 1905, of whom two are laymen, one teaching seventh grade and bookkeeping, and the other, music.⁹⁹

And that seems to be the way it went during the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. I know of no study of the composition of faculties that is in any way complete or even adequate until the surveys made of current realities during the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁰⁰ Donovan and Power both cite statistics from a dissertation about Catholic colleges for men between 1850 and 1866: In 25 colleges, for instance, of 240 teachers only 26 were laymen in 1850.¹⁰¹ Power also cites a government report: In 55 colleges, of 677 teachers only 80 were laymen in 1872.¹⁰²

By the time the National Catholic Welfare Conference began developing educational statistics, the ratios between lay and religious faculty had changed completely. In 1924 lay men and women made up 56 percent of the teaching staffs in Catholic colleges. Ten years later, they made up 62 percent, a ratio that remained constant, according to Donovan, until the end of World War II.¹⁰³

We have to be very careful to understand what these percentages mean, for they represent rather the change in the number of programs and schools incorporated into Catholic colleges than a change in the faculties that were giving what each college considered its "real education." But that is not all the changes represent. For even though the Jesuits, Dominicans, and Ursulines insisted on teaching the philosophy and theology themselves until well after World War II, they were bringing very large numbers of lay men and women onto the "real" faculty. Inevitably, more and more of these recruits came from educational backgrounds other than that of the colleges they joined. If it was no longer possible to find a Christian Brother to teach calculus at St. Mary's College (Winona, Minnesota), it soon became impossible to find even a graduate of the Christian Brothers' schools, as well. If Rockhurst's evening division was typical in the late 1930s, not only non-Jesuits, but men who had not been to a Jesuit college were on the faculties of Jesuit colleges everywhere.

This was the second wave of laicization: the presence on the faculties of men and women who had never been initiated into the educational traditions

of the congregations and orders sponsoring the colleges and universities. What would a man who had been to a public high school and then to St. Peter's in Jersey City know about the spirit of Iona College, endowed by the Irish Christian Brothers? He would know only what he was told or shown, and as he came during the 1960s to be the overwhelming majority, he was told and shown less and less.

The uninitiated faculty member became a definitive challenge to the colleges' common mission because of the unprecedented and explosive growth of Catholic higher education during the 1950s and 1960s. We need to grasp the full dimensions of that growth.

3. Thirty Years of Growth

From 1870 to 1900 an exiguous minority of Americans attended high school, about four percent of the population. With the new century came the needs of industrialization, business expansion, and increased communications, which pushed high school attendance to about fifteen percent of the school-aged children.¹⁰⁴ These continuing pressures and the work of the progressives, "who abandoned the idea that education was the mere acquiring of information and tried to make it a function of society," continued to raise the percentage of children going to high school so that by 1940 three out of four attended.¹⁰⁵

Throughout the nineteenth century, higher education had been for a tiny elite. But by 1910 approximately four percent of the college-aged cohort were attending college. The same pressures, with the addition of the scientific explosion, pushed college attendance to fifteen percent of the cohort by 1940. The real explosion, however, came after World War II, when attendance was seen as the solution to the employment and reentry problems that returning GIs would raise. The "GI Bill" was passed in 1944 and started the flood into higher education. As James Hennesey remarks:

One way of putting it is that the GI Bill marked the watershed in the intellectual history of American Catholicism. Men, and increasingly, women from families which had never thought of college education began to experience it, and many of them were tempted further, into professional studies, but also into academic graduate programs.¹⁰⁶

The results were mind-boggling. Charles O'Hara gave his analysis of national statistics for 1946-1947 in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*:

The 62,108 full-time students in Jesuit institutions in the fall of 1946 were an increase of 179.87 percent over the 22,191 enrolled full-time the year before.¹⁰⁷ Herman Muller reports these numbers for the University of Detroit. In 1944, 1,821 students of whom 52 were veterans; in 1946, 7,489 students of whom 5,000 were veterans.¹⁰⁸

Nationally, the 15 percent of those eligible who had attended college in 1940 leapt to 48 percent in 1970 and kept climbing. In 1950, 2.5 million men and women were in college and university studies; in 1979, 11 million were there. During the mid-1960s, a new college opened every week to accommodate an enrollment which, at 5 million, would more than double in 15 years.¹⁰⁹

What this explosion of student population did to our institutions is laid out in the *Overview* published by the Jesuit Conference in April of 1974.¹¹⁰ The increase spurted at the start: Between 1945 and 1950 total enrollment grew from 38,817 to 90,714--more than a doubling. Large increments continued: 1950 to 1955, 15 percent; 1955 to 1960, 20 percent; 1960 to 1965, almost 20 percent. From 1965 to 1970 came a slowdown, 5 percent. But by 1970 the AJCU institutions enrolled nearly four times the number they had enrolled at the end of World War II: 151,379.

We had undertaken three new institutions since the declaration of war: Fairfield (1942), LeMoyne (1946), and Wheeling (1955). In contrast to 1924, the institutions offered an enormous array of programs in a large array of schools. This variety had distinctly penetrated the liberal-arts colleges, where the average number of majors was 22, stretching from the 16 at the new Wheeling College to Fordham's 36. Nine Jesuit universities offered doctorates; St. Louis, in 34 subjects. For all practical purposes, all of this was fully accredited. Professional schools had shifted and spread, too. There were nine schools of nursing and a number of new professions: the Graduate School of Corporate and Political Communications at Fairfield, Marquette's College of Journalism, St. Louis's Parks College of Aeronautical Technology, and the Labor Management School at the University of San Francisco.¹¹¹

The necessary expansion of faculty that all of this implied is recent enough for most of us to have vivid memories of it. The colleges surely had inquired in 1950 whether a prospective lay faculty member were a practicing Catholic, but their query was first discouraged and then quashed by a series of federal laws--and the laws were passed just as the colleges were hiring

fewer and fewer of their own graduates and more people whom they knew only through vita and dossier. In any case, the administrations had accepted by 1950 an understanding of Cardinal John Henry Newman's thesis that the best way to serve religion in higher education was to achieve genuine academic excellence.¹¹² The colleges' hiring policies and practices gradually came to focus almost entirely on academic credentials. In 1960, Jencks and Riesman write, "80 percent of the faculty in Catholic institutions were graduates of Catholic colleges." However, of those with the M.A., a third were from non-Catholic colleges; and of those with Ph.D.s, half were from non-Catholic colleges.¹¹³ I know of no statistics on the point, but it is impossible for anyone involved in Catholic higher education during the 1960s and 1970s to believe that those percentages got anything but harder on the common mission of the Catholic colleges. The truth is that by 1970 most search committees (the fresh expression of faculty self-governance) did not even inquire about candidates' religion, and he was a very rare dean or vice-president who wanted to know why a prospective faculty member wanted to teach at this institution, with its special religious character and goals.¹¹⁴ The mere interest was déclassé.

The consequences were shattering and quick coming. We all remember periods during which one or other department (the English and sociology departments seemed to lead the way, or a cabal in the faculty senate) was distinctly anti-Jesuit, and most church-related colleges can tell similar stories. The hiring was complicated by the new movement to faculty rights and freedoms during the 1960s, and by certain regional developments such as state aid with its fretfully egalitarian requirements of the leveling sort. Pressure was kept up by the National Defense Act of 1958, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Education Amendments, which were passed just as Project 1 got started in 1972.

This process of laicization had one final moment that shows its full force: The second laicization--of faculty uninitiated into the college's educational tradition--reached into the Society itself. Think of a young Jesuit (well, he's only 34) arriving at a Jesuit college in the mid-1970s. He may have done military service, and he may have gone to a public high school. His course of philosophy was probably largely in English, and his theology, heavily influenced by the currents of Vatican II. He has done his doctorate at, say, the University of Minnesota.

When he arrives at the Jesuit college, he joins a group of Jesuits whose background is framed in what seems like an earlier era. After Catholic grade school and Jesuit high school, they went through a novitiate and juniorate (four years) taught by Jesuits with considerable rigor, an orderly and dense philosophical course (three years) taught by Jesuits from textbooks written in Europe, and a Latin theology course (four years) taught by still other Jesuits from other textbooks by Jesuits, probably published in Rome. If these older men earned doctorates--and only a minority of them got near programs of study outside of the Society--their general educational and world view had been very well formed and had a distinctive quality. They had at least suffered grievously with other Jesuits through fifteen years in the near vicinity of books. They had in all likelihood talked endless hours (having access to neither radio nor television) about why they were studying whatever they were studying, and had produced little folios like *Spring Hill Studies* full of essays trying to make sense of liberal education, the Catholic intellectual, and the product of Jesuit education. These young and these older Jesuits probably already meant something very different by "Jesuit education" in 1972, and they differed specifically on its purposes. Philip Gleason had formulated in 1967 the truly intractable problem they faced: "The most critical problem today is in the area of ideological adjustment--it is a crisis of purpose, a question of the fundamental *raison d'etre* of Catholic higher education."¹¹⁵

The fact is, Gleason was attributing to Catholic education what was true then of all American higher education. The denominations and their colleges, as I shall suggest shortly, were already wrestling with this crisis in their own way. Even wider, experts and practitioners of state and of independent higher education recognized a crisis in purpose, as is suggested by the conclusions of the broadest-based study of higher education ever conducted, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Commission received 21 special reports and technical studies, and produced 80 publications and 30 reprints. It met with several hundred leaders of higher education in 21 states, and came together to work 33 times for a total of 77 days. In 1973, as the Conference staff began work on Project 1, the Commission issued its final report: *Priorities for Action*.¹¹⁶

The report does what its title proclaims. It chooses among all possible actions and course of action those which, in its considered judgment,

are the most urgent and important. These are its first three;

1) Clarification of purposes by institutions and segments of higher education;

2) Preservation and enhancement of the quality of higher education and the diversity of its forms;

3) The advancement of social justice.¹¹⁷

But the Commission was most forceful when it dealt with its first priority, the clarification of purposes. In its very expert judgment, Lionel Trilling had been correct to excoriate "the growing intellectual recessiveness of college and university faculties, their reluctance to formulate any coherent theory for higher education, to discover what its best purposes are."¹¹⁸ The Commission judged that "the colleges seemed intent upon processing more and more graduates almost without regard to the general or specific needs of society . . . and even seemed to have lost faith in the mind."¹¹⁹

In summary. The five intertwined developments which we have been discussing in Part II were the response of higher education to amazing societal changes, and the response allowed extraordinary success in graduate education, in sponsored research, in technological education, and in providing access to higher education even for the most disadvantaged minorities (though there is a lot more still to be done). But the complex response has been hard on general education, very hard on liberal education, and perhaps hardest of all on the common mission of church-related higher education.

Somewhere, Abraham Heschel complained about philosophers having lost the "philosophic nerve" to search for the truth and having turned instead to grovel in grammar. Perhaps in liberal education we were going through an analogous loss of educational nerve, fragmenting ourselves into a panoply of disciplines. Perhaps, finally, in Catholic higher education, we suffered a loss of apostolic nerve, turning from serious zeal for the common mission to eager professionalism. We have found out that no one in the twentieth century creates a religiously oriented institution of higher learning inadvertently.

PART III. REESTABLISHING THE COMMON MISSION

Whatever their identity problems, church-related colleges and universities had waxed along with all of higher education through the 1950s and 1960s. In 1956, Patillo and Mackenzie counted 817 church-related institutions, of which 339 were Catholic (41.5 percent).¹²⁰ But the tide turned about 1970, and when the first National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities gathered at Notre Dame in June of 1979, the total number of church-related institutions may have been decreased by as much as a quarter.

A. A Symbolic National Cooperation

The tide had turned in another way, too, because both churches and colleges had been forced to recognize the damage done to their common mission over the midcentury decades. Further, they began to see their problems and challenges in a broader context and to work ecumenically to face them.

In such a context, the assembly at Notre Dame in 1979 was impressive and symbolic. Altogether, the 750 participants represented well over 600 institutions, not counting seminaries, sponsored by 23 denominations with 100 million church members.¹²¹ Their colleges' operating funds reached \$7 billion that academic year, and their endowments, \$15.5 billion, which some found impressive. The institutions ranged in size from Boston College and Southern Methodist University at 10,000 to Spring Hill College and Hudson College at a few hundred. Altogether, they enrolled 1.2 million students.

That number of students was significantly higher than it had been a decade earlier and magnificently higher than a generation earlier. But, in fact, their teeming enrollments in 1979 represented 25 percent of the college-aged cohort, whereas in 1950 their enrollments had represented 50 percent. That decline was only a symptom. As a whole, the church-related colleges faced a large range of problems which by 1970 had become serious and by 1979 were grave. Jesuit institutions were familiar with all of them; what we were not familiar with then is that all church-related colleges and universities shared them. Few of us were reading the *College Newsletter* or even *The Christian Century*, and we learned from *Time* and the daily papers only about their preoccupations with renowned universities and the woeful

state of academic freedom in Bible colleges. The First National Congress was a visible sign of dawning realization that we all have a common interest in the "endangered service."¹²²

So Jesuits, Marists, and Sisters of the Holy Names whose communities had felt betrayed by rewritten charters and the loosening of control, discovered that the members of the Church of the Brethren had felt the same way when Manchester College and others they sponsored moved to "partnership rather than control." They thought this, Merrimon Cuninggim wrote, "a pulling away from the church."¹²³ During the bright June days of the Congress at Notre Dame, any Catholic who had been involved in the crucifix-in-the-classroom fracas could feel sympathy with the administrators and trustees of Denison College in its brouhaha over an effort to remove from its old gate the description: "A Christian College of Liberal Arts." And any dean who had wondered about hiring non-Catholic faculty would cluck in rueful recognition when he heard that the Upton Report to the United Church of Christ estimated that one of every three faculty members in its thirty institutions was quite unsympathetic to their church-related mission.¹²⁴

During the 1960s and 1970s, incidents abounded of conflict between the religious purposes of the colleges on the one hand and, on the other, due process, faculty rights and freedoms, and the tenure system. The famous case of Erskine College is an instance. The General Synod of the Associated Reformed Presbyterian Church, which sponsors only this one college and names its trustees, asked from each teacher a personal affirmation of the denomination's belief in the inerrancy of Scripture. The Trustees inquired of the Bible department. They said no. The Faculty Senate said that the faculty were searching for truth, not defending dogmata. The Trustees then informed the Synod that the Synod's work was complete once it had named the board. That's putting it a bit baldly, but not inaccurately.¹²⁵

In this and other ways, all church-related institutions had felt what one Jesuit community identified as "the erosion of the institutions." The colleges once realized Jesuit aims and goals; they did not, by 1970, and that must "realistically" be regarded "as a loss."¹²⁶

The National Congress showed that there is a will to maintain the relationship between church and college, though it remains to be seen whether the odds are not too great. Dr. Terry Sanford, President of Duke University, expressed the general sense of the Congress in his keynote address:

Anglicans, Disciples, Mormons, Seventh-Day Adventists, Catholics, all came together "in the flat determination that we are going to survive."¹²⁷ By "we" Sanford meant the churches and the colleges who were together talking.

B. Earlier Projects

Of course, talk at congresses is not enough. What the denominations and their colleges had been doing to sustain their common mission is instructive for its clear parallels to Project 1.

In 1971, for instance, while the provincials were beginning to focus on education, the Seventh-Day Adventists acted on their concern that their ten institutions were losing their original vision and religious purpose. The General Conference set up a Board of Higher Education that began its work by drawing up a rationale of Seventh-Day Adventist presence in higher education. It recommended some policies that included church control over the election of trustees and the appointment of faculty.¹²⁸ In 1972 the Mennonites took their turn. They were concerned with the rising costs of their six colleges, the diffusion of purpose evident in them, and the need for centralized planning. A commission wrote a new statement of roles and relationships, which the denomination promptly approved in 1972 and then reviewed and reaffirmed five years later in 1977.

At about this time, the African Methodist Episcopal Church began feeling pressures for change. It responded by setting up the Association of Institutions of Higher Education, a coordinating agency which is fundamentally under the seven colleges' control, but has strong ties to church government. Almost every other denomination responded in the same ways, setting up commissions, doing studies, publishing rationales and statements of policy and purpose. Two seem worth mentioning at some length because of their parallels with Project 1.

1. The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

LECNA launched its three-year study just as the Jesuit Conference was coming to its decision to look at education.¹²⁹ It established a "Commission on the Future" with a detailed mandate. The Commission was to review the educational needs of the churches, what students the colleges were educating, the strengths and weaknesses of individual Lutheran institutions, and possible

cooperation among them and with the Churches, and then to canvass the political and economic atmosphere for church-related higher education. The Commission reported regularly to LECNA, and at the end of the three years presented a three-volume final report.¹³⁰ Its major findings about the colleges parallel Project 1's in certain respects: Lutheran institutions enjoy a useful independence, strong regional identity, and loyal local support. They would resist any kind of "imposed, static 'master plan'" and they are more likely to respond to "increased voluntary collaboration and 'meshed planning' as a dynamic process," both among themselves and with the Lutheran bodies.¹³¹

The "Commission on the Future" broke up in 1975, but the Lutheran bodies kept working in an interesting way. Just as the Jesuit Conference singled out liberal education in the Easter Letter of 1978, so LECNA singled it out by establishing the Curriculum Consultation Project during 1976-1978 to help each institution identify how it relates faith, career training, and liberal education. More than that, each of the three Lutheran bodies--somewhat like our provinces--undertook special activities on its own.¹³²

2. The Presbyterian Higher Education Task Force

Rather suddenly in 1975 the Presbyterian Church in the United States (PCUS) dropped its officer for higher education, somewhat the way the Jesuit Conference had eliminated the presidency of the JEA from its line officers in 1970.¹³³ Shortly thereafter, in January of 1976, the church held a Higher Education Consultation, which had been in preparation for two years, and which produced an eloquent plea that the church deepen its commitment to higher education. That meant, among other things, increased financial support, the denomination's form of "contributed services." But a "consultation" comes and goes, and the problems grate on. So the presidents of the twenty-two Presbyterian institutions joined into the Association of Presbyterian Colleges, in order to improve communication, work on mutual concerns, and give assistance to the church in its mission in higher education--aims which would be familiar to AJCU presidents.¹³⁴

In response to all of this, PCUS set up a Higher Education Task Force to guide the church's action-reflection project for five years, 1978-1982, inclusive. This Task Force was to do three things: first, develop various models--that is to say, options--for the way PCUS and its institutions can

interrelate; second, develop strategies in the institutions singly and at the national level to reflect on what church-related higher education means; and third, shape guidelines for the church and institution to relate appropriately at each level of contact. The parallels in Project 1 are not at all strained: options, rationales, structures for relationships.¹³⁵

Perhaps the clearest lesson that the Congress taught most of the participants is that the efforts to maintain the common mission of church and college have to be continuing efforts. Most of the stories told by participants to one another were about projects and commissions that worked for some years and left everyone with the conviction that there was still work to be done. And the story of any denomination really determined to sustain the religious commitment of its colleges included the patient building of structures, like PCUS's Higher Education Task Force, and the hammering out of statements, like "The Austin College--Presbyterian Church Covenant."¹³⁶ And then came the patient, sustained effort.

PART IV. THE JESUITS AND THEIR COLLEGES

I think it must be plain that a Jesuit community's view of our common mission is within three horizons. The first is the horizon of higher education in the United States, dotted with professional standards, national tests and accreditations, and competition for students and money. This is the horizon of mathematics, cartography, astronomy, and the like within which Matteo Ricci hoped to establish his personal authority.

The second is the horizon of the church-related college, with its religious ideals and praxis, priestly and prophetic offices, and constant, subtle self-assessments. In Ricci's life this was the vague horizon of religion in China, within which he chose first to don the Buddhist saffron and then to doff it in favor of the bonze's formal robe, hoping that the secular authority he thus acquired would enable him to raise the dawn of Christ's light.

The third horizon against which a Jesuit community must view its common mission is the corporate life of the religious sponsor of church-related colleges. For a religious owns a transcendent horizon contained by no China and by no college. On this horizon Ricci saw rise the command from Valignano to enter China through the door of scholarship in the first place. On it

his successors would see the ugly storm which clouded Ricci's dawning hope.

Of the first horizon: Catholic higher education has hardly had a disproportionate impact on the enormous horizon of all higher education in the United States. Its contribution to the American curriculum is handled in a few sentences by Frederic Rudolph in *Curriculum*, a magisterial tome by the dean of American education historians.¹³⁷ Catholic higher education merited no special remark in *Time*'s survey even though values and wisdom were the theme of the essay.¹³⁸ The truth is, Catholic higher education flourished as an instrument of the Catholic ghetto until during the twentieth century when conformity became a nearly sovereign force, bowling over even the deepest prejudice in the American mind, anti-Catholicism. All Catholic colleges conformed to the judgment made by a provincial of Missouri in 1915: "As we cannot set the standard, we shall have to follow."¹³⁹

I think we ought to note two things about Catholic higher education on this horizon. First, its educators did extraordinarily well for many decades in balancing the necessary conformities to regional and national standards with the necessary nonconformity of its own religious and philosophical purposes and orientations. They were able to maintain the education they thought important against great difficulties, the pressures of which go a long way toward explaining what John Tracy Ellis and others identify as anti-intellectualism.

Second, I believe a strong argument could be made that Catholic and Jesuit institutions are now freer to set their own course than they have ever been before. I will not develop here the well-known conditions favoring this freedom: the interest of professional educators in maintaining private institutions; the access to federal funds that developed contrary to the bitter recommendation of a blue-ribbon commission to President Truman that the private sector be allowed to wither and die; the keen interest in values-oriented higher education; the renewal of the churches' interest in higher education (the American bishops wrote their first pastoral letter on higher education in 1982); the adoption of effective management in our sector. I would add, however, one further favorable condition: While most other higher educators disdain the mere possibility, Catholic and other religious educators are acknowledging the absolute necessity of some measure of consensus on their aims and purposes in teaching and staffing a college. Consensus is the only real long-range planning; the rest is Xeroxed copy.

Jesuit communities view the common mission against a second horizon, church-related higher education. A century ago, these communities' horizon was well and effectively circumscribed by the common appreciation of the *Ratio studiorum* and very active governance by provincials and by Rome. But as regional and national standards multiplied and the pressures to conform to them sharpened, the *Ratio* grew vaguer, and the provincials turned to national cooperation.

A. Forty Years of Work: JEA

From the Revolutionary War through World War I, each province regulated its schools centrally, the way the Maryland-New York province did in 1910 when it sent its eight colleges an eight-page mimeographed document detailing a strictly classical sequence through preparatory and collegiate years.¹⁴⁰ But in 1921, when twenty-five Jesuit colleges and universities already existed, the four provinces began working at the national level. The provincials set up an Interprovince Committee on Education that was to meet every year for a decade.¹⁴¹ In its first session in 1921, the Committee made recommendations that tell a good deal about Jesuit higher education then: Teach fewer subjects in fewer classes. Adopt the departmental structure, setting up at least eight departments. Adopt the major-and-minor curriculum design. Make Greek elective. Appoint student participation in self-government. Appoint student counselors and a placement staff. Separate the high schools from the colleges where this has not been done.

Then, in 1923, provincials and representatives attended General Congregation 27, where they accommodated our legislation to the new Code of Canon Law promulgated by Pope Benedict XV in 1917. Their main success was the *Epitome Instituti Societatis Iesu*.

In the *Epitome*, Part IV is about education, as it is in the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. Some of its prescriptions were as ambiguous in the 1920s as they are today. The chapter *De Scholis Superioribus* speaks only about philosophy, theology, medicine, and law. It says nothing about what Americans thought of as "college."¹⁴² The following chapter, *De Scholis Mediis*, seemed to Americans to be about secondary education, although there were indications that various pieces of legislation accommodated American realities. The chapter requires, for instance, that the subjects of study be carefully chosen for the students' growth toward higher studies, *quantum*

in nobis est, as if aware that requirements were somewhat beyond our control already. It required maintaining the classics as *instituto nostro maxime conformes*, which the colleges struggled with for another twenty years and more.¹⁴³ In general, the *Epitome* directs Jesuit teachers to observe the *Ratio studiorum* and the educational principles laid out in the *Constitutions*. But, as Donohue remarks, "the *Epitome* does not itself specify the character of that methodology nor the precise principles it has in mind."¹⁴⁴

By the end of the 1920s, Father General Wlodimir Ledochowski had taken advice from the provincials of the seven provinces about a nationwide commission on education in our twenty-five colleges and universities. In December of 1930 he established the Commission on Higher Studies, which came to be known as the Macelwane Commission (after the great geophysicist from St. Louis University, who chaired it). The General gave it four tasks: (1) to clarify and unify the Jesuit commitments in higher education; (2) to estimate the standing and reputation of Jesuit colleges; (3) to survey the accrediting agencies; (4) to draw up a plan of graduate studies for Jesuits.¹⁴⁵

Having worked from June of 1931 to July of 1932, the Macelwane Commission submitted a 234-page report to the General which Donohue calls "remarkably honest, not to say blunt."¹⁴⁶ In its candor, realism, and directness, the document reads more like a consultor's annual letter than the report of a committee of the Association of American Colleges. The pages seem remarkably free of *pro domo sua* pleadings, and if the recommendations show any biases, they are not for one or other region or institution, but for the best standards and practices of the day. Actually, the Commission's report would make an excellent study in the inculturation of religious ideals in one area; even to the naked eye, it shows the Ignatian charism being wedded to the exuberant dynamic of American higher education.¹⁴⁷

Father Ledochowski responded to this study with his *Instructio* of August 15, 1934, signed pointedly four hundred years to the day after Ignatius and the first companions pronounced vows on Montmartre. The Instruction established a national association of Jesuit institutions of education, as the Commission had recommended. It also laid out some very general ideas about teaching, emphasizing academic excellence and scholarly research, and finally touched on the training of Jesuits to teach. The Instruction was enforced on a trial basis until 1948, when Father General John Baptist Janssens gave it definitive shape and approval.

The Jesuit Education Association was the *Instructio*'s most visible result. That Association was the instrument for and the embodiment of national cooperation among Jesuits in education. Its annual meetings were trading-grounds for concepts and practices, and a list of the more significant workshops and institutes would map the rise and end of crucial interests and issues in Catholic higher education through four decades.¹⁴⁸ The *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* disseminated information about accreditation, rank and tenure policies (Fordham University published the first Jesuit statement of such policies in 1937), and institutional statutes (*JEQ* printed a model). A considerable number of its articles were influential; in 1936, for instance *JEQ* published norms for evaluating graduate programs in Jesuit schools that one historian of education thinks historically important enough to print as an appendix.¹⁴⁹

During three of its decades, then, the Society found the Association an adequate means of defining our apostolate. But during the 1960s Jesuits felt the JEA failing. Why they felt that needs exploring, but on the surface the reasons seem plain. The twenty-eight institutions were feeling the explosion of unplanned and uneven growth that hit most church-related colleges then, and they were individually following special interests to an extent they had not tried before, setting aside the steady pressures toward conforming to one another that are evidenced in the pages of the *JEQ*. During the 1960s the institutions were aggressively asserting their autonomy in curriculum design and board room. They were eagerly swimming into the middle of the mainstream of American higher education, competing for government aid and research funds and making aggressive shifts in programming, fund-raising, and faculty hiring. They seem to have felt that the JEA was part of the intellectual ghetto deplored by John Tracy Ellis and Thomas O'Dea.¹⁵⁰ They began to doubt the usefulness or even the feasibility of a national association that embraced the now completely diverse interests of four Jesuit commissions (Higher Education, Secondary Education, Houses of Study, Province Directors of Education) and included in a vague "Jesuitness" twenty-eight institutions growing further and further apart in more than size. Consequently, in the winter of 1969, the Board of Directors of the JEA asked each of its commissions to evaluate its work and make suggestions about the future. As a consequence of these evaluations, with the approval of the provincials and of the General, the JEA was dissolved, leaving a mandate to each commission

to determine whether to continue work. The Commission on Houses of Study and that of Province Directors of Education were absorbed into the framework of the Jesuit Conference, in general moving into various units under the Jesuit Conference Commission on Formation, JCCF.

We all know the story of the Jesuit Secondary Education Association. Summoned by the disbanding Commission on Secondary Education of the JEA, Jesuits met in April of 1970 to write a constitution, but their immediate concrete problems with manpower and finances, and particularly their general discouraged sense that the Society was pulling away from secondary education, made that impossible. Instead, from the anguish and hopes they shared, they produced a statement of apostolic purpose in secondary education drawn from the *Exercises* and the *Constitutions*. What came to be known as "The Preamble" was actually a rationale for Jesuit apostolic work in high schools. The committee sent a copy of this document to each Jesuit in high school work and in houses of study, and sent multiple copies to each college and university. Within two months they had received 485 reactions, overwhelmingly approving. The Secondary School Commission took this as a mandate, wrote the Constitution of the JSEA, and submitted it to Father General in July of 1970. The General approved of the JSEA and wrote a strong, heartening letter on the occasion of its first National Convention in March, 1971.¹⁵¹

The Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities also emerged from the breakup of the JEA. Its constitution and by-laws (dated July 1, 1970) show the emphasis on Jesuitness and on national cooperation that had become issues at that time. The AJCU's two Commissions (its Board could establish more) also show the areas requiring most attention then: on Federal and State Relations, and on Educational Policy and Practices. These two Commissions guide the work of the committees--of Vice-Presidents, Campus Ministers, Philosophers, Seismologists, and the like--that had functioned under the JEA.¹⁵²

The most important difference between the old JEA and the new JSEA and AJCU seems obvious but is actually quite subtle: The JEA was integral to the governance of the Assistancy because it was organized and funded by, functioned under, and reported to the provincials. The JSEA and the AJCU are somehow pertinent to the governance of the Assistancy, but in the way any voluntary organization like the Democratic Party or the American Medical

Association is pertinent to civil government. The JSEA and the AJCU were organized by and are financed through their constituent members, function on their own agenda, and report only to their own boards and members. That great shift from JEA to JSEA and AJCU has enlarged the latter's authority in the schools even as it abridged their raw power (no more imposed syllabi).

In the case of the JSEA, that authority continued fundamentally religious, because the Jesuits who wrote the "Preamble" and who launched and struggled to further the JSEA have perceived their work in entirely apostolic terms. They had expected to abandon the national organization, embodying as it did the religious authority of the provincials that had appeared to abandon them. But they found themselves able to produce and commit themselves to the "Preamble."

The case of the AJCU is quite different. The men who launched it had "Jesuitness" clearly in mind, since they were under considerable pressure--from the Carnegie Commission, from national councils and associations, from the laymen on their new boards--to proclaim clearly and forcibly the identity of their private, church-related institutions. But these same men were in no position to invent the means of implementing that "Jesuitness" beyond administrative and political steps like attracting other Jesuits and keeping those aboard content. They were not, after all, religious officials; their offices had been split off from the rector's. Consequently, the AJCU has dissipated the pertinence of national Jesuit organization to obedience. If an official or a Jesuit member has a clear conviction about how that organization fits into his religious life, his conviction comes from his own prayer and reflection and not from a belief that is the common possession of the Assistancy.

B. The Third Horizon: Jesuit Governance

The irony of that situation is that it developed out of the religious reforms called for by Vatican II, which included greater local autonomy and great stress on collegiality. Since those reforms redefined the third horizon of our corporate religious identity, gave shape to Project 1, and should shape our continuing efforts to revive the common mission, we could usefully recall their development in the American Assistancy.

The shape of current Jesuit reform was set by General Congregation 31. For that Congregation received an epochal mandate from Vatican II, which,

instead of giving religious orders the perennial churchly admonition to mind current legislation, sent them back to their roots.¹⁵³ Hence, the Congregation begins its first document with the mandate of the Council's document on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*) to discover and assert our identity as a special religious order, and turns immediately to the adjunct mandate of the decree on the Appropriate Renewal of Religious Life (*Perfectae Caritatis*) to renew "the individual character" and "the heritage of each community."¹⁵⁴ From its beginning, therefore, the current reform was based on finding--"above all in the dynamic development of the Society from its earliest historical beginnings"--who and what we are as Jesuits.¹⁵⁵ The brunt of Vatican II's renewal was, in the first place, identity.

As it happened--we ought to note in passing--this same subject of identity was also much on the minds of our twenty-eight colleges and universities, although what the institutions meant by "Jesuitness" had a rather shallower history than what General Congregation 31 meant by "identity." Yet the coincidence was serendipitous, for even in 1972 the provincials were convinced that we would achieve no internal spiritual renewal without achieving an apostolic renewal (within the colleges) at the same time. With all of us, the provincials had found this conviction implicit in the documents of General Congregation 31 and then had heard it quite explicitly more than once in the talks of Father General Arrupe.¹⁵⁶

This business of identity as a religious order transcended province boundaries, and the provincials found themselves looking for interprovincial cooperation. Their cooperation had started earlier, for in 1957 General Congregation 30 had called for interprovincial commissions of experts to help major superiors in their choice of ministries, but Decree 50 gave no very detailed suggestions. Before the next General Congregation could return to national and regional cooperation, Vatican II uncorked the movement of collegiality in the Church. The Council's documents seem to urge collaboration on the whole world: on bishops (*Christus Dominus*, no. 6), on religious (*Perfectae Caritatis*, no. 23), on missionaries and missiologists (*Ad Gentes*, no. 33). Pope Paul VI made cooperation and collegiality a principal theme in his *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae* (1966; see I, 2; II, 43-43; III, 21). This insistence made its way into General Congregation 31, which passed Decree 22, The Commission for Promoting the Better Choice

of Ministries, in July, 1965, and Decree 45, Interprovincial Cooperation, at the second session, in October, 1966.¹⁵⁷

But neither Vatican II nor General Congregation 31 made very concrete suggestions about that cooperation. So the American provincials combined the notion of a panel of experts with the notion of interprovincial cooperation and launched the *General Survey of the Society of Jesus: North American Assistancy*.

It was to discuss this sophisticated, somewhat improvised five-volume sociological study of the Assistancy that they came together in July of 1970, the summer they saw JEA disbanded and JSEA and AJCU launched. They discovered a number of things in the study that provoked action. They already knew that American Jesuits were altogether alike in lifestyle, work habits, and attitudes, and that each provincial's decisions reverberated across province lines. They saw clearly that the kind of training Jesuits were going through (doctorates in communications, M.B.A.s in group management) and the apostolates they were moving into (Farm Workers and other boundary-less works such as community organizing) begged for some kind of national cooperation. They chose--at the urging of Father General Arrupe--to plan together on certain definite matters, perhaps most memorably on the theologates.

So from July, 1970, to July of 1971, they met four times to attempt this national collaboration. They were trying to reach a process of spiritual decision-making on the theologates that was modeled on the first companions' practices. In one meeting, for instance, each tried to express his indifference about which theologates would be closed; in every meeting they prayed a good deal. But the year was a year of frustration nonetheless, because they had no ways of rationalizing information and no systematic process for working toward conclusions. Moreover, they had no means of communicating outward to the Assistancy, and the provincials were hardly alone in feeling uncertain of what national collaboration meant in our provincial-based way of governance.¹⁵⁸

So in July of 1971 the provincials decided to launch the Jesuit National Leadership Program (JNLP). They met for the first full week of each month during the first six months of the new year. The result was a design called "The Jesuit Conference." It was approved by Father General Arrupe in April, 1972, as the way our provinces would meet the mandate to cooperate regionally.¹⁵⁹

A cardinal point in the new design was that the provincials would work on one matter at a time in some systematic way designed specifically for that matter. What would they start with? They rejected work on the interior spiritual renewal of the Society because they wanted renewal with an apostolic dimension. In this they were following the insistence of Father Arrupe during his visit to the incipient provincials' conferences around the world in 1971 that "the spiritual renewal of the Society must have an apostolic dimension," and that the conferences must help Jesuits "discover again that apostolic drive" which is indispensable to fidelity to vocation.¹⁶⁰

They could not deal with pastoral ministries, having no structures in place to go through to the men; and along the same lines, they were just opening the social-ministries office in the Conference. Finally, they judged that the formation people needed to be let alone for a while.

So in February of 1972 they chose education as the subject of their first project, partially because the structures for a review were in place (in JSEA and AJCU and in Jesuit formation) and partially because a renewal was in some measure already under way (particularly in the JSEA). They wanted "a *project*, not a 'study,'" and they intended from the start to proceed by developing "options from among which choices may be made for the future of our educational apostolate."¹⁶¹ The provincials would later list these reasons for working toward the renewal of our educational apostolate: that education is our principal apostolate in numbers of men engaged and in finances; that it is well established; that the field itself is in flux; that some adaptations in recent years have been--at best--rushed; that the Jesuits ought to respond to the teaching of the American bishops' recent pastoral, *To Teach as Jesus Did*.¹⁶² But this précis--purposefully restrained and understated--hardly hints at concerns that teemed when decades of explosive growth in education and years of astonishing expansion in the Society itself came to an unmistakable halt, and decline of all kinds seemed to poison the decade of Watergate.

What did the Jesuit apostolate in higher education look like from the desks of the provincials in 1972?

C. The Society's Apostolate in 1972

Well, begin with the comparative size of our commitment. In 1972 the provincials were to put 2,330 Jesuits on the status for our institutions of

education: 35 percent of the men in the Assistancy.¹⁶³ Of these they had assigned 1,283 Jesuits, nearly one of every five in the Assistancy, to colleges and universities. That was just a natural consequence of policies in place for a decade: Between 1963 and their meeting in 1973, they had assigned, on the average, two of each three newly ordained men to education, one of them to doctoral studies. At the same time, they had felt Jesuit influence over the colleges (at least) waning throughout the decade. They had helped every college split the superior's job from the president's. They had watched eighteen communities incorporate legally apart from the institutions, and were watching four or five more go through that same separation. They had watched lay men and women join the boards, starting with St. Louis University in 1966 and going through the other institutions like a groan through a football crowd.¹⁶⁴ By 1972 Jesuits made up the full board in only two institutions; at eleven, they were a minority of from 21 to 43 percent. If any provincial had had trouble grasping what was happening, college and university counsel was right there to explain: The Society no longer owned property valued in the tens of millions of dollars and could no longer appoint a president or even an instructor in theology. They had seen Jesuit administrators' hands tied by AAUP procedures, government regulations, and even ephemeral student activism.¹⁶⁵ They had also watched the percentage of these Jesuit administrators plummet, parallel to the drop of Jesuit faculty percentages.

This shrinking, they knew, had been the subject of a celebrated article in one of the last numbers of the *JEQ*. Paul J. Reiss wrote "Faculty and Administration: the Jesuit-Lay Character" with sympathetic loyalty and considerable irony. Having interpreted the devolution of American higher education à la Thorstein Veblen, Reiss concludes that the Jesuit colleges cannot long be known as Jesuit or even as Catholic. Any one of them might come to be known "as an established, and hopefully excellent, college or university which was founded by the Jesuits." Though he would like to see some of them continue Jesuit, "as a sociologist" he does not expect that they will even though Jesuits "have been known for their adaptability." Reiss's last sentence:

I do hope to see in the future several excellent autonomous colleges and universities, founded by Jesuits and in which individual Jesuits, in accordance with their capacities and interests, continue to participate.¹⁶⁶

The provincials had witnessed how speculations like this one, percolating up from the mash of changes, penetrated the Jesuit communities. Some had suffered truly serious disruptions and conflicts, like the one during which a Jesuit administrator was voted a liar by the faculty senate with the help of Jesuit votes. Somehow, their assigning older and retired men to live in the convenience of college communities was suddenly problematic, and they were giving tentative approval for "satellite" communities--into which mostly younger men were fleeing from the status quo. The provincials discovered that half of the rectors thought of themselves as apostolic leaders and half did not.¹⁶⁷ Not that it mattered a great deal. If anyone had a clear notion about what the apostolate was, it was a notion of a first-rate academic institution, preferably large and influential, and that required the courteous reticence of the religious superior while the men went about this secular business.

The provincials--to continue this sad catalogue to its tired end--had begun experiencing difficulty matching doctoral studies with positions in Jesuit institutions. They had also felt the demands of graduate work diminish the apostolic availability of men and even their freedom, and had signed an appalling number of dismissal requests from Jesuit graduate students. They had been faced with the "principle of attraction," which some Jesuits at that time thought was to real obedience what un-cola was to Coke.

What one provincial felt was shared in some measure by all of them: He expressed reluctance in 1972 about sending men to the colleges in his province because "I don't know what I am getting them into." His fix was underscored by a couple of sentences of Father Arrupe's, written just a few months earlier:

*The authentic service of a superior is to seek and discern the will of God, interpreting and manifesting it to his subjects individually and as a community, by means of command. Such a command, in many instances, includes not only a manifestation of God's will, but also an "apostolic mission."*¹⁶⁸

The command this provincial gave the hundreds of his men in higher education was surely God's will--and surely not a defined apostolic mission. He sent them into an unknown world, without even an idea like Valignano's for Ricci, and hoped.

PART V. THE JESUITS AND THE AJCU: REESTABLISHING THE COMMON MISSION

In the history of church-related colleges, the church has grown diffident toward the common mission as often as the college has, and been the main occasion of its slackening or loss. Now, American Jesuits were as likely to have scurvy as to be diffident toward our colleges and universities as long as they were embodiments of our spirituality and of our ambitions for Catholics in American society. But as we watched the walls of the ghetto crumble and fueled our colleges' exciting growth, we began to experience the distancing from them which accompanies secularization.¹⁶⁹

So the question is very pertinent: What was the Society doing to sustain its own interest in and concern for the common mission as the colleges and universities grew into autonomy?

Of course, from 1932 to around the mid-1960s, Jesuits could rely on the JEA to bring into stereoptic focus their apostolic purposes and the academic development of their institutions. They had in it a powerful instrument for developing and disseminating strategies for embodying our apostolic aims in our institutions, a remarkable instrument recognized by friend and sociologist alike.¹⁷⁰ We should note particularly that influence flowed both ways, and our institutions have had definitive impact on our apostolic purposes and poses. Anyone, to look at one fine example, can see the hand of certain leaders of the JEA in General Congregation 31's revised statement on education, particularly in the last phrase:

Finally, for those laymen who generously spend themselves with us in this apostolate, the way should be opened to a wider collaboration with us, whether this be in teaching, administration, or on the board of directors itself.¹⁷¹

American leaders in higher education helped forge in the Society's legislation their institutions' unprecedented autonomy. They saw this autonomy not as much the better of alternatives as the only way to go. Their advice that the provincials dismantle the JEA, therefore, was consonant, since the organism had been established as and structured for enforcible cooperation.

As their national vehicle was coming apart and lay boards were being established to set educational policy, the Jesuit provinces were trying another way to energize their mission in higher education. Between 1965 and 1972 the provinces established assemblies or congresses to act as the commission on ministries mandated by General Congregation 31. In 1972

six provinces had active bodies and three had already abandoned them as unproductive. These bodies, heavily peopled by men from the colleges and universities, acted with energy and verve, producing thousands of pink, gold, and chartreuse pages splattered with enumerations, statistics, and resolutions.

Every province commission inspected higher education in some way. One assembly set up its own Commission for Higher Education, which in its turn established six task forces in each institution and a visiting team of two Jesuits and one lay member from other provinces. The assembly promoted a series of recommendations--approved by the provincial--designed to reinforce the "Jesuitness" of the provinces' institutions. Other provinces' moves on higher education were not that elaborate. One asked the colleges to report how they fulfilled their Jesuit and Catholic aims. Another asked all of the communities to define their corporate purpose and tell how they attained it. Another developed a program aimed at helping the communities discover and realize their apostolic goals in education. Two provinces set priorities in assigning men to higher education, one of them after a province-wide meeting of all of its educators.

By 1973, however, Jesuits had had enough experience to see that the assemblies had no real leverage on the institutions and no structures for continuing influence. When their opinions were canvassed in the spring of 1973, Jesuits themselves felt that "very little province planning has been attempted for higher education," in spite of all the colorful pages.¹⁷² As the assemblies were faltering, another structure was emerging: In most provinces, the provincial and all of the superiors were meeting regularly, developing a sense of community and direction, "with important results in the spirit of openness and trust." But those meetings and that new spirit did not include the presidents, who had been separated from the category of religious superiors. In fact, the Project 1 staff would come to think that the provincials and the presidents did not even know one another's telephone numbers. In the last analysis, efforts in provinces, including the assemblies, went to prove that the need for national cooperation in the apostolate of higher education defined by the Macelwane Commission in 1932 was a continuing need.

A. Project 1: The Flawed Process

To meet that need, the provincials determined to launch Project 1, an effort important enough to require some little analysis even if some of us remember it as a nonevent with a name and staff. The provincials envisioned the project, it must be plain, mainly on the horizon of religious renewal. "It is the *Jesuit apostolate* of education which is of central concern, rather than one or another of its particular forms of expression"--such as a college or university.¹⁷³ They were aware that higher education itself had to be involved in this renewal, having been admonished by Father Arrupe that "the spiritual renewal of the Society must have an apostolic dimension."¹⁷⁴ But they saw the educational renewal of the colleges themselves, not on their religious horizon, but on the horizon inaccessible to them of American higher education in general. The provincials, furthermore, were barely aware of the horizon of church-related colleges and universities--as were the rest of us--and of the efforts then taking shape in the denominations to recapture the great tradition and the common mission. Although the team they gathered was advised by churchmen and educators in Washington, D.C., to canvass the denominations, especially the Lutherans, and other Catholic groups, it did not.

When the men in the institutions first heard about the provincials' project early in 1973, they generally put it in the category of those many reforms sweeping the horizon of American higher education as a whole.¹⁷⁵ Some Jesuits, for instance, wished that the provincials would spearhead a renewal of the *Ratio studiorum*, a renewal they understood principally in terms of the core curriculum. Others were afraid that the provincials were out to do something like that, or worse, to regain their control of the institutions by reverting to consultor-boards, appointing the presidents, and the like. The question of the provincials "regaining control" over our institutions was mindlessly bruited for months, and transmogrified into the question of Jesuits regaining paternalistic or autocratic domination over AJCU institutions. The truth seems to be that Jesuits at that time could not imagine a deliberate Jesuit intervention into autonomous institutions except the one they imagined was threatened by the provincials. This misconception of Project 1 as an educational reform of curriculum, governance, and procedures proved extraordinarily difficult to dissipate, involving

as it did the inability to distinguish between the exercise of power and the exercise of authority.

The fact is, from the beginning the provincials understood better than most that Jesuits no longer had the kind of control over our colleges that would empower us to reinstitute the *Ratio* or impose a common mission even if we could all agree on a *Ratio* to reinstitute or a mission to impose, which was no more likely than the U.S. Congress agreeing to reconstitute immigration law.¹⁷⁶ They knew from the manifestation of men's consciousness that the AJCU institutions were no longer an embodiment of Jesuit Apostolic aims, and perhaps not even proclaiming colleges, in Merrimon Cuningim's terms.¹⁷⁷

This seems to me a remarkable fact. As men having no say over the present or the future of our twenty-eight institutions, the provincials asked for no renewal or reform on the part of those institutions beyond continued membership in the AJCU and a willingness to accommodate the Jesuit communities' initiatives.¹⁷⁸ Yet only a generation earlier, it had been the provincials who decided whether the institutions could drop Latin as a requirement for the B.A. and which institution could take women into what program. Quite as remarkably, the provincials who launched the project (eight of the ten of whom were connected with higher education) neither approved nor disapproved these dramatic changes. Nor did they try to explain them away as common to all Catholic colleges or to all church-related institutions, as they might have done. Instead, they began the project with the same thing they had in mind when they ended it: "How best to exercise our apostolic influence in the present is the question most worthy of our attention."¹⁷⁹

But they thought that the Jesuits had to get their own thinking straight before turning to the institutions. In deciding against a dialog with the institutions about the common mission, the provincials acted differently from the Presbyterians at Austin College, where churchmen and college people cooperated in drawing up their covenant.¹⁸⁰ They acted differently from the United Methodists who offered funds to their 107 institutions for programs furthering the common mission, funds that were accepted. And from the Lutherans, who have continued to deal directly with their 43 institutions.

Looked at in the light of the history of the church-related higher

education, therefore, one of the real limitations of Project 1 appears: the failure of the process to engage the institutions as such, since the institutions must have a role not only in enacting the common mission, but in defining it. Of course, we are much clearer now on this point than anyone was in 1973, including the vast majority of those who were to come to the First National Consultation at Notre Dame in June, 1979. Furthermore, I tend to think that in 1973 the provincials fairly consciously imposed the limitation of staying within the horizon of religious renewal. Early on, they admonished the communities that they would have to shoulder the responsibility of cooperation with their colleagues in the colleges.¹⁸¹ They also deliberately rejected structuring into the project means of involving the institutions, such as regional conferences with administrators and non-Jesuit faculty members, or meetings between the Conference and the colleges' administrators. I believe that the provincials felt they had to reject any activity that might even hint at a planned reduction of the complete autonomy of the colleges. Their choice was by no means political, but the pragmatic enactment of an emerging Jesuit policy in the apostolate in higher education that reached maturity with the Easter Letter.

For in 1974 the Conference made the community the locus of contact with the institutions, and then solicited the cooperation of those communities through the rector--and designedly not through the Jesuit president. That choice has set an important pattern that we have to explore later. Note for the time being the real consequences the choice had at the time. First, it made initiatives of the president to draw the whole institution into the process clumsy and tangential--if any president leaned toward such initiatives.¹⁸² That effectively isolated the institutions from real participation in Project 1, because the president was the only one in a position to involve the whole institution. Then, making the community led by the rector the locus of the project did nothing to close the gap between the twenty-eight presidents and the ten provincials, or to clarify how the president is an apostolic leader. Since the president historically has been crucial in the continued religious orientation of the church-related colleges and universities--or in their rediscovery of their common mission if it has been lost--the Society runs an obvious and serious risk if it does not find a way to make the president an apostolic leader. This remains a consequential question, as will emerge, and not an otiose one.

When Project 1 began in the spring of 1973, we all had little but questions, few of them otiose, so that is where the provincials began:

What questions should be asked with regard to the apostolate of education in the United States? What information needs to be gathered? What problems are in need of a *national* (as opposed to a local or provincial) solution?¹⁸³

Setting the pattern for the whole project, they asked these questions of a wide constituency--their own staffs, rectors and presidents of colleges and high schools, deans and principals. Then the Conference digested the responses and communicated to the entire Assistancy the complex of emerging concerns.¹⁸⁴ They did this through the first of six booklets, *Project 1: An Introduction* (March, 1974), which also introduced the process the provincials had chosen to follow in addressing the apostolates in education.¹⁸⁵

The process was to be a form of consultation, prepared for and reacted to, more intense and extensive than any I have heard of or read about in the literature on church-related higher education, with the possible exception of the Association of Theological Schools' Readiness for Ministry project.¹⁸⁶ Certainly, there is nothing really to compare with the Jesuit process in the most complete survey of then current relationships between the churches and the colleges, *Church Related Higher Education*.¹⁸⁷

Many will vaguely remember the stages of that process. Jesuits had already gotten *Project 1: An Introduction* (March, 1974) when two other booklets fattened their semester-end mail. *Project 1: An Overview* (April, 1974) was a thick compilation of information about Jesuit provinces and institutions of education and an update of William Mehok's projections of Jesuit manpower.¹⁸⁸ *Project 1: The Issues* (April, 1974) attempted systematically the problems and opportunities the Society faced then in secondary and higher education and in nontraditional forms of education. Jesuits discovered, with justifiable chagrin, that they were to give long and prayerful consideration to these issues and let the Conference know whether any were omitted or skewed, before the school year ended. They did not, by and large, consider the busiest month of the school year a good time for this kind of exercise.

When Jesuits returned in the fall of 1974, they found still another booklet awaiting them: *Project 1: Some Options* (August, 1974).¹⁹⁰ In it, they read nine complete plans for a renewed apostolic approach to religious higher education, and by it they were challenged to think of this approach

in the most inclusive and global terms. They were summoned by their rectors to this communal work, and encouraged to include non-Jesuit colleagues in their deliberations. They finished their participation in December, just as delegates to General Congregation 32 were leaving for Rome, and they received a fat report on that participation shortly before those delegates returned in early March, 1975: *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975).¹⁹¹

The provincials had called for "careful thought and prayerful reflection" during virtually the whole of 1973.¹⁹² They had asked American Jesuits to "sift the experience, the ideas, and the desires" they discovered in themselves as apostles in education, in the belief that "only through a process of extensive prayer, reflection, and dialog can the Society of Jesus shape its future apostolate."¹⁹³ Did the provincials get what they wanted?

Project 1: National Consultation (February, 1975) reported the statistics and the "mood" of participation.¹⁹⁴ It noted that "there was initial reluctance to discuss the issues raised in Volume 3 or the Options in Volume 4," certainly no overstatement.¹⁹⁵ The reluctance did not yield far. In spite of several ploys to invite them to prayerful and serious discourse on our common mission, the communities continued to debate whether they had time to meet on the project, and to debate when they did meet. No one should be surprised; debate is academical breathing. No one should be particularly content; the men were there as religious more than as academicians.

At this remove, it is really worth noting the spirit that moved among us. In general, we felt "apprehension and fear of any attempt at national planning among Jesuits in higher education."¹⁹⁶ Recognizing the enormous complexity of higher education and keenly defensive of the autonomy of the institutions, we feared any attempt by provincials to regain control as it had been exercised just a short while earlier. Some sections of the country (and some in each section, apparently) expressed a fear that other sections would take over and force unacceptable decisions on everyone.

Now we would have to look at this mood from many angles to get at the whole of it. But anyone concerned about spiritual freedom will reflect on what it was that moved us to mistrust and fear the provincials' intentions, to feel deeply anxious about merely entering into discourse, and to resist

effectively the invitation to pray about and study over things we were interested in anyhow. Those of us who are engaged in serious scholarship and research are attempting a very difficult thing, the dynamic union of two autonomous lives of the human mind in faith and in intellect, so perhaps our diffidence or even our active resistance can be explained. We do not do the better thing to rest with explanation, however; we need to acknowledge that by and large we did not overwhelm the provincials with our eager zeal in exercising "the constant interplay between experience, reflection, decision and action, in line with the Jesuit ideal of being 'contemplative in action.'"¹⁹⁷

In any case, *National Consultation* presents itself as "a synthesis of the advice the Assistancy wishes to offer the provincials concerning the future of the Jesuit Apostolate in Education," which seems now a rather enthusiastic way of putting things.¹⁹⁸ Chapter 2 reports this summary response:

The Society should pursue an apostolate in Jesuit institutions of higher education which is a corporate apostolate. Its attempt to clarify, redefine, and better realize this corporate apostolate ought to follow Option #1, modified by elements of Option #3 and Option #7.¹⁹⁹

Packed into that paragraph is the advice that Jesuits still wanted to work together nationally on higher education, and that we needed more appropriate structures and some general statement of our apostolic purposes (Option #1). But Jesuits also signaled their basic acceptance of the autonomy of each institution, and desired that "this independence not be misprised as intractability, as though the institutions were beyond Jesuit influence."²⁰⁰ We were realistic in seeing that, due in part to the sheer complexity of higher education and of our institutions, the latter "may prove reluctant to enter into collaborative relationships with the Society," but we felt a reasonable confidence in the way the institutions had been developing and felt no widespread urge to have a plan for withdrawing from recalcitrant institutions (Option #7). Opinion was, at the same time, set against any effort "to regain control," and specifically against imposing a kind of Jesuit rationale on all institutions or setting up an office which would oversee the "Jesuitness" of the institutions (Option #7). But we were clearly in favor of more regularized and rationalized cooperation between the Society and the institutions, at each appropriate level and in

appropriate forms. This was a fresh consideration that emerged during the process itself.

One of the strongest concurrences was that the local community is the focus for our corporate efforts (Option #3). Even where opinion favored a national rationale and the structuring of relationships, it asked that the rationale be developed "with sensitivity to local differences," and that the structures make the communities focal.²⁰¹ This concurrence confirmed the provincials' instinct to go to the communities.

B. The Provincials' Decisions

When *Project 1: National Consultation* appeared in February, 1975, the provincials were coming to the end of General Congregation 32 (December 2, 1974, to March 7, 1975). When they returned, they brought back a more sophisticated grasp of the long-term struggle the Society was going through to define itself, and they carried drafts of *Jesuits Today*, *Our Mission Today*, and *The Union of Minds and Hearts*. The main thrusts of these documents--the fundamental option, for instance, for faith and justice, and the renewal of our religious life by a return to the process of discernment--clearly had an impact on the substance of the agreements and decisions the provincials reached in Project 1.²⁰²

The provincials reached their decisions about higher education in April, 1975, just a month after the Congregation had ended. They distributed a draft, seeking reactions again, and then published *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* in October. They prefaced the agreements and decisions about higher education with the remark that they could not make such detailed decisions for higher education as they had made for secondary education, on three grounds: First, on the religious horizon: the men in higher education "have been unable to engage in studying and analyzing their apostolate to the extent that Jesuits in secondary education have." Second, on the horizon of church-related colleges: the common mission in higher education is difficult to plan and organize because the institutions "have become more independent of the Society" than have high schools. Finally, on the horizon of American higher education at large: the men in a field which is "as a whole complicated and confused at the present time."²⁰³

1. The Rationales

In spite of these problems, the provincials chose to develop a corporate national apostolate, intending to make once again the conviction of the utterly primary apostolic value of education the common possession of all Jesuits in higher education. They would begin at each institution, aware that their choice demanded that each Jesuit community work out its apostolic mission for itself and also cooperate with peers in reaffirming--or reestablishing--the common mission in that institution. They required each community to develop a rationale under the leadership of its rector, and asked that the statement "not remain theoretical but include a concrete plan of action."²⁰⁴ Of course, the provincials asked that each community "focus on the promotion of faith and justice as decreed by the 32nd General Congregation."

This work on rationales, plans of action, and relationships on the part of higher education communities is in fact their apostolic response to the 32nd General Congregation, which should be consciously borne in mind throughout this process.²⁰⁵

The provincials intended the process to continue after they had reached decisions, and published a plan that included explicit dates during 1975 and 1976 for writing deadlines and meetings.²⁰⁶ They also committed themselves to evaluate each community in terms of its own rationale in the future and to ask for continual updating of the rationale. They hoped eventually--actually, they set a date, September, 1976--to publish a national rationale or rationales explaining why *Jesuits* are in church-related colleges and universities along with Methodists, the Holy Cross Fathers, the Friends, and the Sisters of Charity.

As far as I have been able to find out, only one province has pursued this rationale-process with any vigor. That seems to me a loss. Jencks and Riesman believe that the professionalization of scholarship and of the colleges through departmentalization and graduate work was very hard on Protestant colleges and brought many of them to advanced stages of secularization. They also believe that any solution of the tensions between scholarship as a kind of idolatry and rational discourse as an expression of religion will have to be worked out by serious scholars who continue committed to their faith. "The Protestant colleges were secularized because the Protestant clergy lost out in competition with other professional

interests," they wrote, "but the Catholic clergy may prove more resilient."²⁰⁷ They would consequently be disappointed in the faltering efforts at rationales, efforts that would have to go on for all practical purposes among faculty in graduate situations. I think that it is not clear that Jesuits have proven more resilient than their Protestant colleagues, and that is regrettable; there are certainly several Jesuits in our institutions who could make original contributions to exploring the ways that our Ignatian spiritual heritage drives men in higher education today, and many others who could address these ways with great intelligence and insight. Instead, these rationales are currently being composed in the Student Recruitment Offices. In the competition to attract students, they are not likely to reflect with any great accuracy and zeal the prophetic faith and justice issues that we might identify by our way of proceeding.

2. Structures for Relationships

Besides asking for the rationales, the provincials called for the development of six collaborative relationships.²⁰⁸ Here are some notes about what has been accomplished to date:

1. The Jesuit Conference and the AJCU board of presidents are to meet about their relationships in the light of General Congregation 32.

This meeting took place from July 30 to August 1, 1975. It was the first time all of the provincials and all of the college presidents met, and it took place on the occasion of the presidents' journeying to Rome to a meeting there. I think the meeting has not been repeated. The participants spent a good deal of time discussing the best way to conceive the Society's apostolate at an institution ("an apostolate *in* or *at* or *to* a particular institution?" or "an institution *is* the apostolate?").²⁰⁹ They reached no clarity on that question, but did agree that the crucial matter was clarifying the mutual responsibilities of the Society and the institutions--which everyone agreed are independent of one another. They raised but did not try to answer two further questions: How does the individual community member respond in obedience to the institutional authorities and to the Jesuit superior? Who is the "leader" of a corporate, community apostolate in higher education?

It is not plain that we have gone very far in realizing the mandate of General Congregation 32 concerning the "director of the work," which is

what the president is. The Congregation stated that he can have "true religious authority," without suggesting how this is the case, and simultaneously removed the director from the list of those appointed by the General himself.²¹⁰ The meeting itself, and general developments since then, suggest that we have not yet come to consensus on the president's role as a religious superior or the rector's role as an apostolic leader. General Congregation 32 decreed that, where there were any difficulties, "they should be resolved in statutes drawn up for that purpose." Ignatius himself liked sets of statutes, which he required for each institution as well as for each province.²¹¹ Ten years is a long time to let that item languish on an agenda.

I think two problems face us. First, the presidents (with good reason) consider themselves and are considered by their Jesuit brothers primarily as chief executive officers, the representatives of the board to the community at large and even to the Jesuit community. So we tend to concentrate on the power they wield over budgets and faculty status. What we ought to concentrate on is the real authority they bear as scion-spokesmen of one of the truly great education traditions in the world's history. Think of them like the alumni of Princeton in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, who by raising up little Princetons all over the new nation helped join sound learning to enthusiastic belief. Think of them like the alumni of Union College's scientific course, devoted followers of President Eliphalet Nott (who ruled the college in Schenectady for an astonishing sixty-two years, from 1804 to 1866): By 1845 thirty of his students had become college presidents, eagerly spreading Nott's wonderfully optimistic "Christian-scientific assault on nature."²¹² For Jesuit presidents articulate the purposes underlying whatever is functioning as our *Ratio*, and they enunciate the dynamic shifts in apostolic purpose that their educational tradition is still altogether capable of, as Thomas Acker and Charles Currie have done most recently when they were inaugurated, and Timothy Healey, who enunciated this rationale in his inaugural in 1977:

Any college or university with which Jesuits are associated must work for justice and educate for justice. If this is not the burden of what it tries to accomplish in the hearts of its students, as well as in its corporate presence, wherever it may lie and in the world at large, then it is not a Jesuit university.²¹³

For the tradition of which the president speaks authoritatively is personified, not codified in chrome. Does it mean nothing that Jesuit colleges rose and have flourished without an officially promulgated code from 1832 to 1982? It means at least that the source of our educational "philosophy" is the changing, conflicted, renewing life of the Jesuit body. The presidents learn "Jesuitness" from that body, from among whom they are sent to the helm to steer a course for goals being set even as they take the wheel.²¹⁴

The second problem with authorities concerns the rectors. I think we have to convey to the men we make rectors in the colleges and universities all of the expectations of local superiors laid out in General Congregation 32--for instance, in *Our Mission Today*--where they emerge principally as the men who facilitate the community's communal discernment on its apostolate.²¹⁵ I have more to say about this below.

2. The second collaborative relationship the provincials committed themselves to was that among presidents and rectors, as a group, on a regular basis.

This has been carried out in the "triple three," the standing commission of three provincials, three rectors, and three presidents, set up just after the Easter Letter in 1978. The group has been meeting twice a year, communicating the concerns and hope of each larger group into and out of the commission. The current interest among rectors in apostolic leadership, for instance, seems to have emerged from this group's work. In June of 1982 the joint committee completed a year's work on "Guidelines for the Assignment of Jesuit Personnel in Higher Education," published by the Jesuit Conference.²¹⁶ Currently, the "triple three" seems to be searching for an agenda, which may strike some as surprising.

3. The provincials also directed that the rectors of the twenty-eight communities meet annually.

The rectors have been doing that, as HERO, Higher Education Rectors' Organization, which has an element of truth in it. In their more recent meetings, the rectors are very far from the concerns of early rectors' meetings with internal community problems and tensions. Instead, they have been discussing the inexorable reduction in the number of Jesuits at their institutions and the implications of that reduction to their "Jesuitness." They see clearly that each community will have to devise its own way of

guaranteeing this Jesuitness, and they are certain that this implies an ongoing process. I am not certain that they feel confident about the communities' ability at present to accomplish it, particularly since they insist that each community has to do it in its own way. Complicating the matter further, the rectors judge that any process would have to include lay colleagues, not merely because Vatican II requires it, but because the process would be futile without that collaboration.

Who will initiate and guide that process? The rectors are beginning to see that, if it is to be done, they are the ones to begin and guide the communal discernment and perhaps even the collaborative efforts with lay colleagues.²¹⁷ At their meeting at Georgetown in October, 1982, they discussed a paper on this topic that proposed in clear and forceful terms: that the higher education communities were defensive during Project 1 and are still waiting for some solution to their malaise; that the communities do not now have a way of controlling their apostolate; that the community has to begin to think of itself as a team missioned to its institution; that the rector has to emerge as the apostolic leader of that team; that the community has to find its way to mutual respect and trust in order to keep refining its mission; that the provincial ought, along with the community itself, to evaluate from time to time each institution's loyalty to the common mission. One of the paper's most original insights is its definition of "control." Moving away from the word's meaning when Project 1 began a decade ago, the paper suggests that control means that the Jesuits know what they want to do at their institution.

The way to know their mission is through the reflection process that General Congregation 32 determined to call "discernment" and about which it legislated that "the local superior, and at times the provincial as well, will take part."²¹⁸ It seems obvious that if a community feels acephalous, then its rector is not doing his proper work.

The individual Jesuit normally receives his mission from his provincial superior; but it belongs to the local superior to adapt that mission to local circumstances and to promote the sense of solidarity of the members of the community with each other and with the whole body of the Society to which they belong.²¹⁹

4. The provincials mandated a fourth collaborative relationship: The presidents and the Jesuit communities are to establish regular channels of communication.

Santa Clara was the first, to my knowledge, to start regular meetings, when Thomas Terry was president. Loyola of the South currently holds monthly meetings, scheduled by the president, who meets weekly with the community's rector. My information in this matter is sketchy, but I believe that one or other community and president meet desultorily; some, never. As far as meetings between presidents and rectors go, they used to happen only when something came up like thunder across the bay. Now this "regular channel of communication" is much more regular, another structure becoming firm.

5. The provincials requested regional meetings to bring together rectors, presidents, and board chairmen "to articulate the grounds of common interest, mutual concern, and anticipated collaboration, for the strengthening of the overall apostolate of Jesuit higher education in the United States."²²⁰

At least one such meeting was held in the fall of 1975, but although the provincials asked that the groups reconvene the next spring, I know of no follow-up.

6. The provincials agreed, finally, to assign province coordinators to help the communities work on the rationales.

The coordinators started in September, 1975, and by February, 1977, had forwarded the rationales to the Conference.

In brief summary, these were the agreements and decisions made by the provincials. In general, it is fair to say that they were a strong and definite assertion of the Jesuit apostolate in our colleges and universities. It is also fair to say that they were consciously open-ended, leaving almost nothing in final form except their determination to continue a process of renewal. The provincials envisioned this renewal as the implementation of General Congregation 32's decrees, particularly of its fundamental option for justice and of its reiterated insistence on continued communal discernment in apostolic works and purposes. But they were also quite clear that Jesuits and lay colleagues would have to cooperate, and that some institutions might not respond to Jesuit initiatives and therefore not be amenable to corporate Jesuit apostolates.

The provincials did not say what they might do if this became clear in a given institution, though at one point in the process they were fairly clear that such an institution would not be able to draw more Jesuits. And, of course, they legally registered "Jesuit" as a trademark. They did that

for more than educational purposes, which was just as well. At Erskine College, anyhow, the church's problem was not a pirating of its good name; the college wanted to remove the trademark.

PART VI. FIRST STEPS IN THE RENEWAL OF THE APOSTOLATE

In February of 1977 the provincials met in St. Louis and reviewed all of the communities' rationales. Shortly after that, they received from the rectors (who met in March) a strong suggestion that a further statement from the provincials was necessary. The provincials agreed, and at Easter, 1978, published "The Jesuit Mission in Higher Education."²²¹

With this letter they wrote finis to Project 1, Higher Education. In it they made something of an attempt to write a "national rationale" for Jesuit apostolates in higher education, though it seems to me that they tried to stay away from both abstractions and cant, and declared that they would "speak frankly."²²² On one point they were quite frank: They hoped that their message "will be of interest to our non-Jesuit colleagues," but they are not addressing them directly, "just as we are not addressing the institutions as such."²²³

They wrote a letter with two parts. In the first they asked and answered the question: "Why do we feel it is a realization of 'Our Mission Today' to maintain a significant corporate presence in these institutions?"²²⁴ Their answer: our vigorous tradition in education, our spirituality that attends to fact and insists on reflective openness, our mandates from popes, generals, and congregations. They develop at some length the notion that "presence" means that "the community itself has a mission, and each Jesuit shares in that mission," and that means "corporate plans and accountability for our mission."²²⁵ They reach back to the *Ratio* to insist that "we are teachers. . . . [with] a concern for the growth of others in their personalities and gifts."²²⁶ From Vatican II they take considerations about priestly service, and from General Congregation 32, the conviction that "Jesuits are to be identified as *agents of change*."²²⁷ They remind us that "the traditional perception of Jesuits" is as "*men of ethical concern*," which they believe is to be expressed in our day by involvement in social analysis and the development of new concepts that will contribute to solving both moral problems and socio-economic inequities.²²⁸

The provincials then turn to the second part of their letter. In it they develop the Jesuit response to changes and challenges in higher education as an apostolate. This response, they say, is *with faith* that the change from institutional control to total collaboration is "in the providential guidance of God."²²⁹ The response is *in the spirit of the Spiritual Exercises*, by which they mean specifically "the process of discernment that the 32nd General Congregation asks our communities to use in shaping their apostolic mission." They speak frankly again to the effect that neither they nor anyone else has "pat answers" to our apostolic questions, "but our heritage has a concrete way in which to address them."²³⁰ Finally, the provincials say that the Jesuit response to changes in the apostolate in higher education is made *in obedience*, leaving us free (even if tenured) to accept another mission.

The general grounds for the response laid, the provincials "mention some more specific ways that you and your communities should consider for achieving your purposes more effectively."²³¹

I believe this wording is very careful and exact. The provincials will state directly that the communities "should" continue the process of Project 1. But they are aware that many communities do not have the necessary dispositions to move to communal discourse, let alone discernment. The men bring departmental and other loyalties into the community's meetings, and the academicians' inveterate penchant for challenge and competition. The result is not prayerful deliberation but debate. Hence, the provincials are indicating what they want to happen, but what they do not feel in a position to command. Perhaps this is the reason why most of them, or all but one or other, have dropped the projected practice of reviewing the rationale and action plan annually or at regular intervals.

In any case, here is the list of specifics:

1. Each community should develop and keep updated a rationale for its apostolate to its college or university. This ought to involve the way of proceeding that we call "spiritual discernment," and it ought to work out the connections between the institution represented by the Jesuit president and the community represented by the Jesuit rector.

2. The cooperation of our non-Jesuit colleagues is essential, so communities must find ways to share with them our Ignatian heritage. If non-Jesuit colleagues experience Ignatian spirituality, we can confidently

let ourselves be "learners as well as teachers" in setting the common mission.

3. Jesuit communities and their residences ought to be embodiments of "Christian harmony, prayer, simplicity of life, and zeal for justice."²³³ And of lively intellectual life as well.

4. Each professional school should offer its students both "competence and conscience."

5. Campus ministry, which is to the whole community, should work at "inculturating" the faith and the sacraments.

6. Jesuits ought to have experiences of unbelief and of injustice during the summer months or recesses.

7. The provincials take note of "the high priority being given to carefully designed programs of liberal studies that integrate human and ethical values" and endorse that priority.²³⁴

8. Jesuits should be alert to the possibilities of having influence on the world around them through "consultation, research, publication, and public advocacy when called for," and should remember that we have connections all around the world and own a supranational vision.²³⁵

The provincials endorse the status quo in our institutions, just as the rationales had endorsed it (taking this status quo in an optimistic sense). But they certainly gave a clear indication to men under obedience of what they want: They want the new departure of serving justice to become central to our apostolate in higher education. They want the communities to embody this commitment to justice, so that even if the institutions do not themselves embody the ideals of Jesuit education, the communities will. In that embodiment they want Jesuits to use prayerful discourse as a means to reach concrete decisions and cooperation with their lay colleagues.

They have some convictions about the education given in our institutions. They are clear, for example, that it should convey values--our values of principled action, of critical assessment of social injustices, and of the humanistic relevance of philosophy and theology to all other learning. They completely endorse the shift in Catholic institutions from paternalism to collegialship, a shift that they baptize and consider the realization of Vatican II. They appreciate the analysis and planning that go into the institutions' programs and want them reflected in Jesuit communities' activities. They think that Jesuits should reach out to alumni and alumnae, urging continuing spiritual development particularly in the faith

that does justice. They hope that, in ways not specified, Jesuits will introduce ethical and moral experts into the educational process. They ask that Jesuits take whatever appropriate and possible steps they can to introduce into a collegiate education that has become intensely job-oriented the great Catholic tradition in humanities, philosophy, and theology. They envision a campus ministry which is not a team of exhorters, but which calls on interdisciplinary collaboration to inculturate religion. They show a clear bias toward innovative liberal-arts curricula.

But for all of that, the provincials' main concern in this letter is the renewal of the communities themselves in their interior lives--moving toward the continuing conversion commanded by Vatican II and General Congregation 32--and in the apostolic expressions of that interior life. They end their letter with the strongest statement approving higher education in any of their documents:

We are convinced that this is an enormously valuable apostolate in which the time, energies, and love of our men should be expended--to the service of our neighbor and the greater glory of God.²³⁶

CONCLUSION

"One of the more striking instances of adaptation in the history of the Society," William V. Bangert contends, was the change from the *Ratio studiorum* school to the American college and university. Bangert believes that the Jesuits' decision (or series of decisions) to make that adaptation is "comparable to the initial election to embrace the humanism of the sixteenth century and place it at the service of the Church."²³⁷

Other religious groups and other institutions made analogous adaptations, however, and it is sobering to note that as recently as 1926 many institutions that are now completely secular still had compulsory chapel, for instances, Yale, Williams, Brown, Vassar, and Penn. Along with them, during the last fifty years, we have doffed the saffron of tight church-relatedness and donned the bonze's robes of commitment first and foremost to academic excellence. Have we, then, gone the way of Yale and Vassar, Williams and Penn? Is Fordham "no longer Jesuit"? Did Marquette actually choose academic excellence over Jesuit identity?²³⁸ Will our certain decline in manpower finish the process toward secularization begun by "yielding control"?

Certainly, Jesuit colleges are no longer what Merrimon Cuninggim calls Embodying Colleges, and have not been since World War II.²³⁹ None of them is an extension of Jesuit community or the pure embodiment of Vatican II orthodoxy. Hence, they disappoint anyone who thinks that "Jesuit" can be properly applied only to the Catholic equivalent of the evangelical Bible college.

But these Jesuit institutions--in publications, special programs, and ordinary course-design--give witness to the Society's conscious commitment to matters of justice and faith and to the liturgical, ecclesial, and pastoral renewals of Vatican II. Further, our institutions' concern for values stands out and is a realization of the Jesuit purpose in the pursuit of academic excellence. David Riesman, who has been visiting Catholic colleges for thirty years to compare them with secular counterparts, had this to say about Jesuit identity in an article that we should all read annually:

The identification of the Jesuit colleges with the Jesuit versions of Catholic traditions means that there is a strong sense of historical and philosophical continuity. Rhetoric and dialectic are understood in historical rather than in contemporary, faddish terms. There is an insistence on the importance of the inquiring mind, an insistence linked on the one hand with Catholic philosophical traditions, and on the other hand with the universality of the Church and its tradition of serious and respectable differences of opinion, which are particularly marked in this country, as earlier in Holland and Germany, since Vatican II.²⁴⁰

Plainly, our colleges and universities are what Cuninggim calls Proclaiming Colleges. They show, at least to the likes of David Riesman, that if it is possible to pursue apostolic purposes in teaching grammar, it is also possible to pursue them in reaching academic excellence in higher learning.

Some Jesuits find that unbelievable, judging that they cannot hear any proclaiming at all coming from our institutions. Even they, however, unless they choose to be doctrinaire, can recognize every one of our institutions as what Cuninggim calls Consonant Colleges. For our colleges and universities are true allies of the Society in our apostolic purposes, and are far from being merely equal with state institutions as loci of our apostolic work--as some of us used to claim vehemently. To take just the one instance, in what state institution would the president find support in the board and practical cooperation in the faculty for his continual proclamation that concern for faith and justice characterizes his institution's pursuit of

learning? Each of our twenty-eight institutions does more than merely acknowledge itself as Jesuit, and if each is more or less adroit in exercising its identity, we ought to recognize that an institution participates modally in "Jesuitness" according to its size, region, history, finances, student constituencies, and a lot more.

For it is with institutions the way it is with faculty members: Everyone does not have to participate in the college's common mission in the same way, but there are modes of doing it. Some are charismatic spokesmen for the tradition and some are not overeager to understand it. Some are fired by the hope of shaping human lives and some, by cell membrane transfers. What is crucial is that faculty members appreciate this particular institution for its particular history and character, and actively take part in its self-definition. This dynamic self-definition of the Jesuit education tradition has certain implications on all three horizons, that of higher education at large in America, that of church-related higher education, and that of our own religious life. A look at each horizon in turn will clarify certain imperatives and autonomies.

First, the horizon of higher education itself currently raises in high profile one imperative: In the middle of incessant change, each institution will keep reaching for "some clear understanding" about "what it intends to accomplish," as the Carnegie Commission declared.

The task . . . will be difficult, because the understandings that could be chosen and emphasized are numerous and are not available in ready-to-wear versions. They have to be institutionally tailored.

The task will require courage, for the priorities involved are often surrounded by controversy.²⁴¹

The task will also demand continued discourse by the faculty about education, and all faculties are loath to do that. Jesuits are particularly reluctant, perhaps because we seem to have adapted ourselves out of the power over educational purpose in our institutions. We need to consider two things.

First, as the story of church-related education in this country has clearly shown, we have abdicated a power we never held absolutely--or Xavier would never have had a commercial course, Boston College would not have dropped Latin, Loyola of the South would not have substituted Religious Studies for Theology, the University of San Francisco would not have a faculty union, and so forth. Our freedom to define precisely the educational mission of a given institution has never been as untrammelled as myth

has it, but has been constrained constantly by the struggle to get students, enough money, and a reasonable cadre of teachers who understood what the institution was all about. And this is how we made the epochal adaptation Bangert is so pleased with.

Second, Jesuits have been adopting and adapting since Ignatius collected statutes from the great universities of his day. During the nineteenth century in particular we used an astonishing panoply of matters and processes and yet managed to keep a distinctiveness that everyone recognized. The truth seems to be that only very rarely is some specific educational choice crucial to our purposes. Our real enemy is academic drift.

Hence, if Jesuits are serious about apostolic mission in higher education, we will consider the current secular imperative to clarify each institution's educational purpose a fine opportunity. Too often we act as if we thought it an infernal nuisance.

Second, the horizon of church-related higher education silhouettes this worry: For centuries Jesuit education was characterized by the kind of control that permitted us to set both educational goals (and norms and practices down to numbing minutiae) and the common mission shared by the Society and a given institution. We have now learned that the American experience in higher education exacts the same toll of every sponsoring religious body: shared authority. We have learned further that the denominations rest easy with shared authority, and that there are modes of church-relatedness other than Bible-college control. We are now trying to find out how these modes can serve our apostolic purposes, and our most crucial and central effort must be learning how to hold on to our apostolic purposes and yet be peers of our lay (and non-Catholic Christian and Jewish) colleagues.

Probably we would have abandoned paternalism under pressure of the American Association of University Professors and of our own professional self-esteem. But theoretically at least (by the interpretation of the Jesuit provincials) we have chosen to consider this sharing of authority providential in the history of Jesuit education, an appropriate acknowledgment of the proper role of the laity in the Church. We therefore enter discourse with lay colleagues as with complete peers, expecting to learn at least as much as we contribute to any dialog. But we have to keep in mind that each faculty stands in its own history and tradition, which validate this

particular faculty's actions. Most especially in church-related institutions of liberal learning, a faculty's decisions will be authentic and not mere aping of megaversities or name-brand schools only if in general the faculty understands the institution's character. Now of all members, Jesuits are justly expected to grasp what that entails and perhaps even to embody the tradition in its most recent epoch. We Jesuits feel uncomfortable with that responsibility, which seems simultaneously to require us to stand in perfect solidarity with the faculty and to stand apart as unique.

Here is the specifically educational reason why Jesuits would want to share their Ignatian heritage of ways of proceeding, methods of praying, and approaches to understanding the principles of human action and the foundation of human life. We experience that spiritual heritage as the ground out of which grow our desires to teach and research and administer. We find the experience difficult to articulate, but when we reflect on our lives we know that the Spiritual Exercises and our Jesuit life have made us want to serve God and the Church in specific ways. Well, we want our lay colleagues to have that experience or at least to know about it. For the lay person who experiences the gratitude of the sinner to be called to labor with Christ will not only empathize with Jesuit hopes in education, but will prove a creative force in the institution in his or her own right, and will have just such desires to teach and research and administer as Jesuits have, to spread the Kingdom and to find God in all things. And the lay person who at least understands the Ignatian spiritual experience is vastly better prepared to see why we want to cling to a core curriculum and why we have so swiftly sympathized with the faith that does justice.

In reality, the whole faculty contributes to setting the common mission since that mission involves both educational and apostolic purposes. For this reason, we appreciate the importance of inviting the lay faculty to enter into our spiritual heritage. We will persuade only a few to make an Ignatian retreat, of course, and we will probably alienate a few. But we expect such a wide range of participation--again, modal--because of the two kinds of difficulties such apostolic work confronts in higher education. We face the ordinary difficulties of drawing any person to a deeper Christian commitment and involvement, and we also face the extraordinary difficulties of attracting to commitment and involvement people whose professionalism requires of them that they detach their personal values from their public

lives. We know that deep religious commitment and strong spiritual motivations remain *déclassé* in academia today, though not as mindlessly as before the Vietnam War era.

That detachment of personal values and commitments from research and education--the combination of professionalism and positivism that permeated higher learning in America just as Jesuits determined to create colleges and universities out of our schools--has been an integral part of the laicization of the faculty in our institutions (as well as in others, of course). As I suggested earlier on, the laicization penetrated even the Jesuits on the faculties, in some measure. As a consequence, our spiritual discourse with our lay colleagues, our inviting them to enter into our spiritual heritage, is precisely the Jesuit solution to the problems raised by that laicization. For, given a basis in the experience of our spirituality, we could begin again looking at the "Jesuit philosophy of education" that has proven so elusive for decades, with some hope of making sense of it.²⁴² But without that basis any attempt to explain the Jesuit philosophy will continue to sound elegiac, a feckless exercise in the history of ideas.

Jesuits in higher education, unlike our counterparts in secondary education, have given no evidence of appreciating the importance of inviting our lay colleagues into contact with our spirituality. We are not really convinced that our spiritual apostolate to our lay peers has any educational significance. We do not hold many days on the Jesuit tradition like the one that recently invited the whole faculty and staff of Loyola of the South. We do not convene regularly groups to study and pray, like the one at Seattle University. We do not project faculty retreat weekends, as Boston College now projects.

We could watch the common mission founder in the shallows of that neglect.

Third. The horizon of our religious life in the Society. In 1965 we swung into the pastoral orientations of Vatican II the way sailors on a wild sea swing into a sheltered cove. Scores of us moved into religious studies and campus ministry; the pastoral seemed so concrete and definite, its aims so readily articulated and measured. In 1975 we lined up with the new orientation to faith and justice almost as readily, particularly in egregious problems like sexism and hunger and disarmament, each of which had some kind of currency in the world of higher learning. This justice

orientation gave a concreteness to the project of penetrating the higher learning with our faith.

But both the pastoral orientation and the faith-and-justice commitment have the nature of projects within the larger enterprise of Jesuit higher education. For the responsibilities we took on when we made that series of decisions to move away from the *Ratio studiorum* school into the world of higher learning reach beyond the social and the political, the directly pastoral and ecclesiastical. In entering that world we have exposed our religious and spiritual tradition to the probing of informed intellect and to the conflicts inexorably raised by intellectual breakthroughs. *Fides quaerens intellectum* was one enterprise within the enclosure of Christian Europe; it is quite another in the wide open, formally pluralistic, and aggressively valueless world of America's higher learning. Hence, the lament in *Our Mission Today* that we are "too often insulated from any real contact with unbelief" is without ground in our colleges and universities, where we are steeped in every kind of privilege, but where we feel the sting of skepticism and doubt all day long.²⁴³

Are we ready, with discernment and with reliance on a community which is alive and apostolic, to bear witness to the Gospel in the painful situations where our faith and our hope are tested by unbelief and injustice?²⁴⁴

The Congregation was envisioning situations of corrosive poverty and dispossession, but its question confronts each of us in higher education just as really, and it confronts our communities.

First, about us as individuals. Jesuits stand as coequal professional peers with lay colleagues, but we are also other than professional scholars and teachers. Each of us has to find ways of being objective yet faith-filled, critical thinkers yet loyal members, pragmatic in working for academic success and yet docile to the cross. That is, we give witness to our colleagues that we carry on the academic enterprise and the faith quest simultaneously, creatively, and fruitfully. We give this witness in concrete matters: tenure cases, committee work on a document on financial exigency, controversy over presentations on campus by Planned Parenthood, the perennial adjusting of the core curriculum. In his response to such issues, a Jesuit's commitment emerges, or rather the priorities among his commitments as apostle, scholar, teacher or administrator, colleague, friend. His way of dealing with such concrete matters displays his priorities and elicits his creative

contribution to the institution's common mission. Hence, a Jesuit's interior life--his aliveness to God, his selflessness, his scholarly creativity, his virtues, his refusals--are of direct apostolic interest, because in discourse and in deciding he enacts that interior life, and it becomes known.

Isn't that enough? Even put in these simpleminded terms, a Jesuit's contribution shows its force and authority. Why is Jesuit community life pertinent to the common mission in our colleges and universities?

Second, about us in community. We are in community because life in Christ is a matter of community; but that is pertinent to Christians all over. We are in community because of our vowed life; but that common life is not pertinent to our colleges and universities as it once was.

Currently, our community life is pertinent to the common mission as the principal source of its religious orientation.²⁴⁵ Why? No authority can now tell us what apostolic aims to pursue in our institutions, as the provincials' Easter Letter demonstrates, and no authority can tell our institutions what common mission to pursue, as each of their charters would demonstrate. Neither can any one person dictate apostolic aims to Jesuits, or the common mission to an institution.

The only possible source for apostolic aims in higher education among Jesuits, and the major source for the religious component of the common mission in each institution, is the community of Jesuits. They may be instructed by the bishops' statements and the Congregations and the provincials, and they may find help in the meetings of the AJCU. But because of the autonomy of their institution and because of the historical role of Jesuits in those institutions, the Jesuits themselves as a community must mediate gospel aims and the specific aims of the Church and the Society to each institution. They will surely find themselves pulling in yoke with apostolic lay men and women; but the community as such is an indispensable source.

This implies a group enacting aims and articulating them for a social group (the college or university community) that has turned willing conformity into a powerful force for success. It also clearly implies that the communities will have to find a way to each discourse at the level of our personal faith and hope. We will have to overcome the cultural conditioning in our aversion to meeting and in our fear that religious "sharing" is a-rational if not anti-intellectual. This will be difficult; we have not so far been very good at saying in community what we believe before God in

the common understanding that our religious affects--aversion or attraction, tranquillity or disturbance--will be simply respected. One community, in February of 1983, was amazed how useful and encouraging it is to go around the room at the start of its meeting to allow each one to say simply what he is involved in. That community is approaching O'Hare with a ten-word English vocabulary. We will have to rectify this if we are going to identify and affirm those apostolic desires that fuel our drive to hold faith and intellect together and that inform the common mission of our institution. As Father Arrupe wrote:

It is the intuition of love that succeeds in uniting elements that, without such love, would seem to be irreconcilable or at least to give rise to dichotomies and tensions that restrain the true apostolic drive: action--contemplation, faith--justice, obedience--liberty, poverty--efficiency, unity--pluralism, a sense of the particular--a sense of the universal.²⁴⁶

As the last Congregation pointed out, each community has an apostolic function as a community: to apply "discreet charity" to apostolic decisions, as a group; to cooperate in isolating and enacting ways and means of accomplishing the mission we are sent on; "to help each of us overcome reluctance, fear and apathy."²⁴⁷

This is what the provincials hoped the Jesuit communities would begin to accomplish when they called for the work on rationales in 1975. The provincials have not withdrawn that mandate, which each of them repeated when he formally signed the Easter Letter in 1978. The provincials clearly hope that each community will find its way to some level of consensus on its apostolate, bringing that consensus up to date each year.

For the Society recognizes with greater clarity than ever, and the whole Church is aware, that no one could really tell Matteo Ricci what he should and should not do when he entered China 400 years ago. Many could offer helpful reflections--and did; but only those actually in the strange new world were in a position to observe, reflect, and pray in order to make the decisions that would effectively bring Christ to light and the wonderfully cultured bonzes to Christ. We are in the same position. Many can offer helpful reflections, but if the Jesuits at a given institution do not identify their apostolic aims and contribute to the institution's common mission, then some who do not hold a privileged position in the Jesuit tradition, or any position at all, will.

William Bangert calls attention to the fact that American Jesuit colleges and universities are "the uniquely American contribution to the history of Jesuit education."²⁴⁸

At this critical juncture, those of us now working in these institutions need to remember that our contribution may be historically unique, but it is not finished. We are still writing the history of Jesuit education.

APPENDIX

THE JESUIT MISSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Letter from the American Provincials

(Easter, 1978)

Dear Brothers in Christ:

The Peace of Christ.

[1]. In this letter we provincials¹ are writing directly to our brother Jesuits serving the twenty-eight Jesuit institutions of higher education in the United States. We will speak frankly of our Jesuit aims in higher education, and we hope thus to foster, as fully as possible, our cooperation and common identity in this apostolate.

[2]. This letter is an expression of our corporate commitment to that apostolate. For our part, we pledge ourselves to continue preparing and assigning young Jesuits to this important apostolic work.

[3]. Accordingly, as we write, we think also of those Jesuits still in formation who have a serious interest in learning and a talent for teaching and who have not yet been given a mission to a specific work. Aware of the long, hard preparation necessary for the college and university apostolate, we hope to elicit their enthusiasm for it.

[4]. Jesuits in higher education at non-Jesuit institutions, or in other ministries, will also be interested in this letter, since we all share a common mission. Moreover, we hope its message will be of interest to our non-Jesuit colleagues. They will appreciate, we are sure, the appropriateness of our not speaking to them directly, just as we are not addressing the institutions as such.

[5]. Although much remains to be done, especially at the provincial and local level, this letter marks, for the higher education apostolate,

1 The letter was distributed by the Jesuit Conference of the Society of Jesus in the United States, from its National Offices, now located at 1424 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

The numbering in brackets ([1, 2, etc.]) of the paragraphs has been added here, for purposes of easy reference from the text in this present issue of *Studies*.

the formal completion of the national process begun four years ago as one of the major undertakings of Project 1. (Cf. *Appendix I.*)

[6]. The purpose of this statement is not to impose a "national rationale" upon each of our higher education communities. Rather, it should direct and stimulate the implementation of contemporary Jesuit ideals within local communities.

Jesuit Identity and Motivation in Higher Education

[7]. Why will we continue to give Jesuits a mission to the apostolate of higher education at Jesuit colleges and universities? Why do we feel it is a realization of "*Our Mission Today*" to maintain a significant corporate presence in these institutions?

[8]. These are not theoretical questions. Not only do Jesuits in the work of higher education ask them; just as challenging is the fact that they are sometimes asked by Jesuits in other apostolic works. Often implied in the questions is a judgment that teaching, research, administration, and campus ministry cannot be as apostolically responsive to the mandates of the 32nd General Congregation as the pastoral and social ministries. We do not believe this to be true.

[9]. Apart from any claim that the Jesuit task today is fulfilled only in formal education, the service of Jesuits in higher education nonetheless reflects a vigorous tradition in the Society, inasmuch as the learning, scholarship, and discerning wisdom inculcated there have long been features of Jesuit identity. Our world--with its virtues and vices, its beliefs and unbeliefs, its achievements and failures--derives strength and meaning from many forces; and, among these, the academic disciplines often figure prominently. Thoroughly professional cultivation of the disciplines influencing the world's vision, and its direction therefore toward good or bad, is a preeminent responsibility for us in virtue of the educational mission we pursue in the Church.

[10]. Ignatian spirituality strengthens this motivation in us by developing dispositions required for scholarly inquiry and service: objectivity; an openness to being "claimed" by the truth as it is revealed; attentiveness to the value in any proposition; the freedom to change our minds; a perception of the relativity of all finite expressions of God's

reality; and, above all, a desire to contemplate whatever is true, good, or beautiful.

[11]. The Society thus has been called repeatedly by Popes and Fathers General to work in the exacting worlds of learning and rigorous thought. Our centuries-old mission to this apostolate was recently renewed and reinforced both by Pope Paul VI and by Father Pedro Arrupe. Father General, in a statement on *"Evangelization and the Catholic University"* at the 1974 Synod of Bishops, expressed himself this way:

The world in which the Church must today bring the message of Christ is profoundly marked by a new power--that of science, culture, and research. The institution that best represents this new power is the modern university . . .

Does not the pursuit of more pressing pastoral objectives often neglect the indirect, yet fundamental, apostolate of learning, particularly at its higher level?

[12]. Our most recent General Congregation also confirms this motivation, especially in its decree on mission and identity. The former reminds us that we must be "ready to give ourselves to the demanding and serious study of theology, philosophy, and the human sciences which are ever more necessary if we are to understand and try to resolve the problems of the world." (No. 35) The latter decree, in setting forth its notes of Jesuit identity, provides further explanation of why Jesuits serve at Jesuit colleges and universities.

[13]. We are *religious of the Society of Jesus*, given a mission, by the Church and through our superiors, to live poorly, chastely, and obediently in a community with a corporate work at a particular institution. The community itself thus has a mission, and each Jesuit shares in that mission to the extent that he actually participates, with his confreres and under his superiors, in the achievement of that corporate effort.

[14]. As religious in community, we know that, over and above the contribution of each Jesuit to the apostolate, certain aspects of our life together should give witness to the Christian values we profess. Such aspects include: our union of minds and hearts both in prayer and in faith, hope, and love; the frugality of our life; corporate plans and accountability for our mission; a loyal and affectionate support of differing viewpoints among brothers; the fraternal encouragement of creativity in developing one

another's gifts for fuller service; generous financial contributions to the university or college.

[15]. With this corporate mission, we are *ambassadors and apostles of Christ*. It is to His person and Gospel we bear witness, and we do this in the manner appropriate to the community's mission. We are and must be "professional academics," but our primary identification is that of Christian apostle, and this identification informs our academic role and labor.

[16]. We exercise corporate apostleship by proclaiming Jesus' Gospel in the great variety of languages and forms that our varied academic disciplines and professional responsibilities contribute to the institution's pursuit of truth. Moreover, by appreciating and sharing among ourselves the richness that each discipline contributes to this pursuit, we make our communities creative centers of multidisciplinary understanding and cooperation, so as to enrich even more the vision and effectiveness of Jesuit higher education.

[17]. Rooted in companionship with Jesus, ours are *communities of priestly service*, and our priesthood mediates Jesus' sacramental presence amid His human family by healing and reconciling. Gratefully and joyfully, in sacrament and word, we share the celebration of Jesus' loving and redemptive presence.

[18]. We are *teachers*. This is true of all Jesuits, whatever their particular apostolate. But some of us are "teachers" in the more formal sense. This identity commits us to a concern for the growth of others in their personalities and gifts. Beyond our concern for ideas and structures and the value they have in themselves, there is our basic interest in and love for the people we serve. Higher education provides a unique range of possibilities for their human development. Skills and maturity acquired by them in their earlier education make possible at the higher level a conscious pursuit of wisdom. At this level, educators can form communities of interdisciplinary inquiry and reflection into which students are progressively incorporated, not only as pupils but as teachers, since a principal mark of the good educator is his readiness to learn from those he serves.

[19]. Another such mark is the teacher's concern to serve those who need his help the most. This the educator does out of love for those he serves and out of the joy he finds in their development. The 32nd General Congregation highlights this long-standing apostolic pedagogy when it urges us to seek out the neediest, to learn from their personal needs, and to help them to a competence that makes us dispensable.

[20]. With renewed emphasis since the 32nd General Congregation,

Jesuits are to be identified as *agents of change*, through a corporate mission of the service of faith and the promotion of justice. This mission and the way the Congregation describes it for us oblige us to deepen and broaden our self-understanding, in order to appreciate the solidarity we share with all men and women of our day, especially the poor and the oppressed.

[21]. Both our identity and our motivation--as religious in community, as priests and apostles on a mission of scholarship--are expressed in the call of the General Congregation's fourth decree, "*Our Mission Today*." Our responsiveness to this call still varies from person to person. There is a growing recognition, nevertheless, that we must be sensitive to the social and economic inequities that afflict the majority in the world today.

[22]. A number of our higher education communities have taken to heart this call, which is addressed to them as much as it is to more explicitly pastoral and social works. But, together, we are invited to develop this commitment further in a way appropriate to the educational apostolate. This will be a difficult task because of the complexity of higher education and its rapid evolution in American society today. None of us has the blueprint. We must be convinced, however, of the urgency to develop this sensitivity through community reflection, planning, and action.

[23]. Related to our identity as apostles of justice in the service of faith is the traditional perception of Jesuits as *men of ethical concern*. Surely this concern must now go beyond our being sensitive confessors and competent moral counselors. The mission to justice requires, particularly of Jesuits in higher education, the development of new concepts and analyses that will contribute to the solution of socio-economic inequities and other moral problems of our day. If indeed our identity as men of ethical concern is to influence the culture of these times with professional and apostolic efficacy, we need Jesuits in higher education.

Jesuit Response to Change and New Challenges

[24]. In the past decade, the social, cultural, and educational context in which we exercise our mission has changed irrevocably. Religious changes have accompanied changes in society, national life, and education. We do ourselves no service by lamenting or denying this fact, or, on the other hand, by claiming that every change has been an unmixed blessing or

the result of the wisest decisions. Whatever the case, this changed world of ours is the only one in which we are called to work out our mission. How best to exercise our apostolic influence in the present is the question most worthy of our attention.

[25]. The changes affecting education are particularly instructive for the consideration and development of our Jesuit response. (Cf. *Appendix II.*)

[26]. Some of the tensions caused by these significant changes have been settled, others still remain, and some, like the decline in vocations, have begun to be reversed. Still it is clear that, even to the present time, the nation, the Church, and the Society are continuing their rapid evolution.

[27]. How are Jesuits to respond to these changes and challenges? Let us first consider the spirit of a Jesuit response. We will then give examples of concrete ways in which the higher education communities, their rectors, their presidents, and individual Jesuit faculty members are responding.

[28]. We respond *with faith*. A transition from the position of institutional "control" to one of full collaboration has been challenging for a number of Jesuits. Our faith in the providential guidance of God must now be accompanied by an attitude of mutual dependence and deep trust in others. We realize more fully that Jesuits are not alone in searching for the truth and in helping students discover it.

[29]. It is a truism of any ecclesial or ecumenical experience that the voice of our colleagues is indispensable for the realistic vision and direction of a value-oriented educational mission. This cooperation is not a matter of yielding to numerical or political necessity, but of heeding particular charisms. There are other voices to be heard, and the Spirit can speak through them. We recall to you the extensive treatment given to this point by Father General in his address, "*Pioneers of the Spirit*," delivered in Philadelphia in 1976.

[30]. We respond *in the spirit of the Spiritual Exercises*. Through the great moments of the Exercises runs the process of knowing, loving, and serving the Lord. It is this same Ignatian process of discernment that the 32nd General Congregation asks our communities to use in shaping their apostolic mission. Disposed to do whatever seems best in the

Lord, the community will bring wisdom to bear on the pros and cons of any issue. It weighs them against the value of Christ and His Standard in a communal effort to know the feelings and convictions which the alternatives evoke from the community. A decision or choice is made, and confirmation of its correctness is sought in the process of implementation. This Jesuit way should form Jesuit personality and community. The 32nd General Congregation asks us--with singular emphasis--to use this process of Ignatian discernment both individually and communally and even applies it to the contemporary context (Decree 4, *"Our Mission Today,"* Nos. 44-45; 70-74). There can be no pat answers to the apostolic questions we face today, but our heritage has a concrete way in which to address them.

[31]. We respond *in obedience*. Past history alone does not explain the Society's presence in higher education. No Jesuit merely "happens" to be serving in a Jesuit institution of higher education; he is there because he has been sent on this mission by the Society. Even when tenured, a Jesuit remains free to accept another mission from the Society. Within this mystery of religious authority and obedience is the source of a Jesuit's confidence and peace. This obedience is ultimately to God, who calls Jesuits to this difficult apostolate. He calls through the confusion, faithfulness, and injustice of our world, which manifest such urgent need of that enlightened service proper to the mission of Jesuit universities and colleges: solid research and scholarship; personalized and sensitive forms of pedagogy; and professional challenges to the dehumanizing assumptions and ideologies of our day.

[32]. We will now mention some more specific ways that you and your communities should consider for achieving your purposes more effectively. Some communities are already using these ideas; others are just beginning.

[33]. 1. The communities should continue the process of apostolic planning for their mission. Rationales should be periodically reviewed both by the communities and by us, and concrete plans of action should be drawn up. The care we take in planning apostolic strategies must reflect the careful study and analysis made by the universities and colleges in their over-all programming. This will be difficult because of our inexperience with this kind of planning and because of our need to develop the required predispositions and skills. But we must move in this direction.

[34]. Ideally, apostolic planning by communities should be undertaken in the context of spiritual discernment, and the roles of both rector and president as apostolic leaders are essential. Both rectors and presidents are Jesuits who are accountable to the Society. Both share a leadership mission from the Society, though they exercise it in different ways and with different responsibilities. In our campus communities some progress has been made in clarifying the roles of the rector and the president as a result of their meeting regularly to coordinate the community's work in the institution. This clarification should continue with the knowledge, support, and participation of the community.

[35]. The apostolic importance of the president's position--not only in the college or university, the civic community, professional and educational associations, and public and private higher education, but also with alumni and friends--should not be underestimated. It is the responsibility of the local Jesuit community and the province, through their cooperation and expressions of moral and fraternal support, to help him succeed in his difficult mission.

[36]. 2. So important is it to our apostolic purposes that we act as true colleagues of our non-Jesuit co-workers that the communities should consider specific means for sharing our Ignatian heritage. In this dialogue, we must be learners as well as teachers. The Jesuit apostolic effort should not be limited to students, but should include the faculty, administration, and staff.

[37]. Also, the service that Jesuits render alumni and alumnae deserves greater attention, especially with respect to continued spiritual development and the sharing of the ideals of our Jesuit mission.

[38]. 3. Jesuit residences, often located in the heart of a campus, have the possibility of providing more than housing for Jesuits. Communities, in collaboration with the institution, can be centers of a Jesuit presence that initiates intellectual and religious services for students, faculty, and staff. Such a development requires community sharing of goals and a willingness to yield some privacy for the sake of our mission. Jesuit communities on our campuses should be living, accessible symbols of Christian harmony, prayer, simplicity of life, and zeal for justice.

[39]. 4. In undergraduate and graduate professional schools, students are learning the skills to enter professions or public service. Our Jesuit purpose in professional education is to train men and women of both competence and conscience. By awakening in these students a sense of values to be honored, and principles to be adhered to, we can carry out the mission to influence society given us in the 32nd General Congregation.

[40]. Bringing a refined and well-informed ethical dimension into course presentations and professional training could be given impetus and special vitality through the resources of the Society of Jesus. Jesuits have a unique opportunity, in their network of friendships throughout the Assistancy and the world, of calling on well-trained ethicists and moral theologians to help them and their non-Jesuit colleagues develop this ethical dimensions.

[41]. In professional training, too, it should be of special concern to Jesuits that, wherever appropriate and possible, the resources of the Catholic tradition in the humanities, philosophy, and theology be brought to bear, in full confidence that this may be done with the professional rigor proper to an institution of higher education.

[42]. 5. Through collaboration with the campus ministry staff, all Jesuits can minister to an extraordinarily gifted and influential campus community. A college or university community has an abundance of resources (drama, music, literature, the sciences, art, philosophy, and theology) by which to serve students, faculty, and staff in "inculturating" the sacramental and paraliturgical expressions of contemporary Catholic faith in the United States. This kind of interdisciplinary collaboration is also a resource for other religious educators.

[43]. 6. During the summer months or recesses, when not engaged in research or teaching, Jesuits have excellent opportunities in social or spiritual ministries that can give them direct experience of the ways unbelief and injustice are affecting people's lives. This experience not only can sharpen their own academic focus, but can influence others.

[44]. 7. All Jesuit undergraduate colleges and schools are committed to a liberal arts curriculum, or a core program of humanistic studies, especially congenial to the fundamental human

values we cherish. In face of the strong inclination of many students toward career specialization and narrow professionalism, Jesuits have the opportunity to offer them a curriculum that frees them to act thoughtfully, rather than to be mastered by circumstances or unexamined convention.

[45]. We endorse the high priority being given to carefully designed programs of liberal studies that integrate human and ethical values, because we all share the conviction that through them students gain freedom from undue preoccupation with security, from insensitivity to the plight of the morally deprived and the socially oppressed, and from paralysis before seemingly unchangeable political, economic, and social mores.

[46]. 8. There are many opportunities open to us to influence our world through consultation, research, publication, and public advocacy when called for. To exercise this important role perceptively, we have the unique resource of our international brotherhood. Jesuits from other nations, alive to realities different from our own, can help us become sensitive to the claims of an international common good and world order. Thus we are enabled to nourish our national vision and to help direct national energies to the good of the entire human family. In the years ahead, as Americans with a universal vision and commitment, we will have increasing need of wisdom from many sources, and our international relationships through Jesuit higher education can be among the most fruitful.

Conclusion

[47]. We are encouraged by the serious reflection in which most of the communities have already engaged, as manifested in their rationales. We concur with the common recognition that the primary responsibility of the Jesuit community lies in service to the university or college. We also welcome a growing recognition that the communities have wider responsibilities to the Church and civic community and, in particular, to the poor.

[48]. We wish to encourage the communities to enter into a continuing dialogue with the representatives of the local Church and civic communities about how effective our service to them has been in the past and how it might be improved in the future.

[49]. We recognize that much planning remains to be done. This message to you in the apostolate is intended as a solid starting point for

a continuing process of reflection and implementation. That is the task before us--each of you, your communities, the rectors, the presidents, and ourselves.

[50]. We repeat here our corporate commitment to this apostolate in the Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. As we said at the beginning, we pledge ourselves to continue to prepare and assign young Jesuits to this apostolate. In doing this, we assume that, for their part, institutional leaders are ready to make practical plans with us to encourage the use of these trained young Jesuits and the purposes they represent in our corporate enterprise.

[51]. We pledge ourselves to support and to collaborate with institutional leadership, board members and presidents especially. We promise to support community leadership, the rectors especially, in the responsibility which the Society has given them to develop strong community participation in the progressive refinement of rationale statements and plans of action. We will review these plans, evaluate and approve them, and give all the support we can to their attainment.

[52]. The way ahead will not be easy as we labor in the exacting circumstances mentioned above. This is our reality today. But we do have a way. We are coming to grips with the issues and vital questions. We are convinced that this is an enormously valuable apostolate in which the time, energies, and love of our men should be expended--to the service of our neighbor and the greater glory of God. We are encouraged by the Ignatian reflection that though the task is ours, the power really is the Lord's; and we are trying to prepare the way for His power.

Sincerely in Christ,

Terrance L. Mahan, S.J.
California Province

Richard T. Cleary, S.J.
New England Province

Daniel L. Flaherty, S.J.
Chicago Province

Thomas H. Stahel, S.J.
New Orleans Province

Michael J. Lavelle, S.J.
Detroit Province

Eamon G. Taylor, S.J.
New York Province

Joseph A. Panuska, S.J.
Maryland Province

William J. Loyens, S.J.
Oregon Province

Leo F. Weber, S.J.
Missouri Province

Bruce F. Biever, S.J.
Wisconsin Province

Easter, 1978

Appendix I The Process

[53]. Project I moved from the broadest questions about our apostolate of higher education to the specific issues confronting it, then to the possible approaches to be used in addressing these issues and, eventually in April 1975, to one particular approach. This was entitled, *Corporate National Apostolate in Higher Education*. In addition, modifications were drawn from two other options: *Corporate Local Community Apostolate* and *Continuing Adaptation Model*.

[54]. In testing and implementing that choice, each community was asked to work toward the articulation of a "community rationale," to be translated into a concrete "plan of action" for the following year. In February 1977 at our meeting in St. Louis, we reviewed all these community rationales in an effort to discover how you see yourselves, your communities, and your apostolic work. In March 1977, the rectors of the higher education communities also reviewed the rationales and insisted upon the value and need of a statement from us.

[55]. Our analysis and review was an attempt to "read the signs of the times" so as to get a more comprehensive view of the resources, problems, and opportunities which appear universal, and thus to reinforce a common identity and promote cooperation in this apostolate throughout the United States.

Appendix II Changes Affecting Jesuit Higher Education

[56]. After World War II, American higher education began an extended period of unprecedented prosperity and growth generated by a new public estimation of the value of college and university education for personal and national development. Support for this growth and prosperity came from new programs of public and private funding, like the GI Bill, and institutional grants from foundations, business, and industry. Enrollment in practically all of the established institutions of higher education rose dramatically, and new two-year and four-year colleges in the hundreds, both private and public, were opened. Career opportunities for the college and university graduate in the professions (including higher education itself),

public service, and commerce and industry multiplied and expanded rapidly. Government and industry sought the collaboration of higher education for the training of graduates with new and advanced skills, and for the development of technology, the discovery of ideas, and the creation of management systems.

[57]. Along with all private higher education, Jesuit institutions grew and prospered with this new confidence and support of the American public. The increase in vocations to the Society was considerable. Many more young Jesuits were given advanced studies and training in the academic disciplines and were then assigned to the apostolate. While our corporate presence at the universities and colleges grew, at many of them the growth in the number of exceptionally gifted, committed, and highly trained non-Jesuit colleagues in faculty and administrative positions was even greater.

[58]. Beginning with the mid-1960's, the pattern of growth and internal stability in American colleges and universities took a turn. Within practically every institution, internal pressures, which reflected and were influenced by external forces tearing at the soul of the nation and challenging our domestic and international priorities, introduced a period of severe tension, painful self-examination, and extensive administrative, faculty, and curricular adjustments. Further, this period often saw the development of new managerial tensions and financial retrenchment. The inflationary curve and periodic slowdowns in the national economy also placed new pressures, on the private institutions especially, to seek more funding from private and public sources, in order to control tuition and other costs and keep them reasonably competitive with public higher education.

[59]. To date, our corporate presence at Jesuit institutions has remained apostolically significant and effective in terms of both numbers and professional achievement. But we all recognize the uncertainties clouding the future. We are now experiencing the impact of the decline of vocations and the large number of separations from the Society that occurred in the sixties. These are facts which cannot be ignored.

[60]. During the recent past, there also have been significant changes in the Society and the Church itself. For example, the traditional role of authority was questioned, and its exercise has evolved in the direction of broader consultation and more effective participation; greater stress began to be placed on community, on shared apostolic planning, and on discerning interaction by community members; fuller attention and apostolic

weight were given to individual choice in the context of community discernment; dissension in matters of theory and practice was expressed, tolerated, and even supported; liturgical and sacramental forms were being altered and sometimes were meeting resistance; there was an increased sensitivity to the needs and claims of the poor that challenged the middle-class values of Jesuits and our communities; and there has been a clear emphasis on the ideals of openness, theological renewal, ecumenism, and pluralism in place of an over-reliance on parochial isolation and authoritarianism.

[61]. These developments were background to a crucial change in the recent history of American Jesuit higher education: the decision to constitute the governing boards of the colleges and universities independent in fact, as well as in law, of the jurisdiction of the provincial and of Father General. These institutions from their foundings were incorporated with a charter and a governing board under civil law. Generally, however, this board was composed of Jesuit consultors to the Jesuit rector-president of the institution, who was ultimately responsible to the provincial and to Father General and not to the board members.

[62]. The understanding of the new relationship between the autonomous institution and the affiliated Jesuit community representing the Society on campus was commonly expressed in articles of agreement and by-laws framed by mutual consent to insure the preservations of the founding purposes of the institution. These relationships are still evolving.

[63]. Many compelling reasons motivated this transfer of authority and responsibility, not the least of which were, in most instances, the requirements of the legal integrity of the civil charter and the complexity of the institution's financial needs. In the interest of securing and promoting the very values for which these institutions were founded, Jesuits had to find another way.

[64]. A number of consequences followed this revision of the Society's relationship to these institutions. To mention a few that affect Jesuits most directly: the need to define new collaborative working relationships between the province and the community on the one side and the institution on the other, between the provincial and the president, and between the president and the rector for the good of the community's apostolic mission and the institution's educational goals; the need to

recruit Jesuits for faculty and administrative positions; the need of Jesuit candidates to be attentive to normal academic procedure in seeking appointments and qualifying for faculty tenure; the need to collaborate more intimately with all colleagues in a school, department, or committee in order to bring Jesuit values to bear on academic programs and faculty and student life.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 "The Jesuit Mission in Higher Education," Letter of the American Provincials, Washington, D.C., Jesuit Conference National Office, Easter, 1978. See the Appendix to this paper, in which the Easter Letter has been given paragraph numbers.
- 2 See M. J. Fitzsimons, S.J., "The *Instructio*, 1934-1959," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, 12 (1950), 69-78.
- 3 There is no history of Jesuit education in the United States and no adequate history of Catholic higher education itself. The best, Edward J. Power, *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States*, Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1958, covers little of the 20th century.
Timothy F. Cronin, S.J., *Seattle University: 1891-1966*, unpublished dissertation, Seattle University, 1982, lists the extant histories of Jesuit institutions, which are as uneven as the stories at a family gathering.
- 4 See Andrew M. Greeley, *From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Higher Education*, New York, McGraw Hill, 1969; and *The Changing Catholic College* (with William Van Cleve and Grace Ann Carroll), Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.
- 5 Merrimon Cuninggim, "Varieties of Church-Relatedness in Higher Education," *Church Related Higher Education*, Robert Rue Parsonage, ed., Valley Forge, Pa., Judson Press, 1978, 35.
- 6 This was the *doctrina tradita*. See Allan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1938. John W. Donohue, in a project for the Jesuit Education Association, wrote a luminous essay on this topic, "On Motives and Origins: St. Ignatius and Education," which is the first chapter in his *Jesuit Education*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1963.
Finally, see the seminal article by Pedro Leturia, S.J., "Why the Society of Jesus Became a Teaching Order," translated from the *Gregorianum* (Vol. XXI, No. 3, 1940) and printed in the *JEQ*, 3 (June, 1941), 31-54.
- 7 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 34.
- 8 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 36.
- 9 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 32.
- 10 James Hennessey, S.J., Address to Roman Catholic Caucus of the First National Congress of Church-Related Colleges and Universities, Notre Dame, June 21-23, 1979, Xeroxed and privately circulated.
- 11 John W. Padberg, S.J., "The Choice of Education as a Jesuit Apostolate: Some Notes from History," *Project 1: The Jesuit Apostolate of Education in the United States*, No. 4 (August, 1974), *Some Options*, 112.
This is one of the six booklets published during Project 1, which will be referred to in this format: *Project 1: Some Options* (August, 1974).
- 12 Padberg, *Project 1: Some Options* (August, 1974), 112.
- 13 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 11-12.
- 14 Easter Letter, 1978, #3 and #4.

- 15 "The Jesuit Mission in Higher Education: Guidelines for the Assignment of Jesuit Personnel in Higher Education," Washington, D.C., Jesuit Conference National Office, June, 1982.
- 16 Easter Letter, 1978, #33 and #34.
- 17 Christopher Jencks and David R. Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, Garden City, Doubleday and Co., 1968, 405.
- 18 Just in 1973, one of the most authoritative lists of the current changes was published in *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*, New York, McGraw Hill, 1973, 44ff. It included:
 New kinds of students, particularly from low-income backgrounds and from minorities; political activism; career changes; new interests among students such as "emotional growth"; new kinds of careers and jobs in an explosive market; new social problems demanding serious research; new problems that the colleges have to face in the cities; new technology of learning, "the most important for higher education in 500 years."
- 19 See Philip Runkel, Roger Harrison, Margaret Runkel, eds., *The Changing College Classroom*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1960; also Lewis B. Mayhew and Patrick J. Ford, S.J., *Changing the Curriculum*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1971.
 The Carnegie Foundation would later publish "A Contemporary Review with Suggestions," *Missions of the College Curriculum*, Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- 20 David J. O'Brien, "The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* (November, 1981), 7: "Often, these men have grown weary of the collective enterprise, with its endless meetings and fruitless discussion."
- 21 "The common mission" became a buzzword at the First National Congress mentioned in the third item in the Introduction. See the Congress's papers and addresses: Ben C. Fisher, ed., *New Pathways: A Dialogue in Christian Higher Education*, Mercer University Press, 1980.
- 22 *Missions of the College Curriculum*, 1977, 150.
- 23 J. S. Brubacher and W. Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968*, New York, Harper and Row, 1968, 8.
- 24 Jencks and Riesman, 1968, 321.
- 25 Guy E. Snavelly, *The Church and the Four-Year College*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1955, 187.
- 26 Donald Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War*, New York, Columbia University, 1932, 33.
- 27 Manning M. Pattillo, Jr., and Donald M. Mackenzie, *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States*, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1966, 5.
- 28 J. A. Tetlow, S.J., "Churches and Colleges: Recapturing the Great Tradition," *America*, Vol. 141, No. 21 (December 29, 1979), 423.
- 29 Donohue, S.J., 1963, 98.

- 30 George Ganss, S.J., *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1954. See also Ganss, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, Translated with an Introduction and a Commentary, St. Louis, Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970, in which the footnotes to Part IV constitute a valuable resource.
- 31 Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, 8.
- 32 John M. Daley, S.J., *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 1957, 76. Carroll wrote this just after the first National Synod at Baltimore, November 7-10, 1771, and published it on May 23, 1792.

The ex-Jesuits who are running the college, he says, are "men devoted by principle and profession to instruct all who resort to them in useful learning, and those of our religion in its principles and duties." Note the implication that there are non-Catholics in the college, as there surely were in Jesuit institutions from the start.
- 33 This list was developed out of two collegiate surveys: Clarence E. Lovejoy, *Lovejoy's College Guide*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1976; and *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, Ninth Edition, Woodbury, N.Y., 1974.

Lovejoy distinguishes between institutions that are "church-related" and those that are "church-controlled," showing a certain prudence in going no further.
- 34 Power, 1958, Appendix A, sketches the founding of 19th-century Catholic colleges.
- 35 Power, 1958, 333-335. He is listing only colleges for men.
- 36 Power, 1958, Appendix A, 256. In this appendix, Power writes a few sentences about each of the colleges founded between 1786 and 1849, many of them droll.
- 37 This list is developed from *The Directory of Catholic Colleges and Schools*, Compiled by F. M. Crowley and E. P. Dunne, Washington, D.C., National Catholic Welfare Conference Bureau of Education, 1928, Third revised edition.

Jencks and Riesman, 1968, 321, point out that there is nothing like an adequate listing of women's college foundations. Using a sociological formula, they estimate that about 1,000 have been launched in the United States.
- 38 Philip Gleason, "American Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective," *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education*, Robert Hassenger, ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1967, 33. Though Gleason does not say so, these numbers must represent only institutions for men.
- 39 Gleason, 1967, 33.
- 40 Power, 1958, 55. See also Donohue, S.J., 1963, 74, on Jesuit European origins.
- 41 Daley, 1957, 104-112.
- 42 In an address at the observance of the 150 years of the *Boston Pilot's* publication, John Tracy Ellis said that Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., had told him this "a quarter century ago." "Address," *Origins*, Vol. 5, No. 15 (September 27, 1979), 232.

43 Cited in Pattillo and Mackenzie, 1966, 4.

44 Whitman Willson, ed., *Jefferson's Letters*, Eau Claire, Wisconsin, E. M. Hale, 1940, 338-339.

This opinion is generally cited as Jefferson's, but it was a commonplace among the Founding Fathers. Jefferson was keenly interested in public education and wanted his work on the University of Virginia memorialized on his tombstone (it is).

45 See Daniel Boorstin, *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1948, on "The Moral Sense and the Life of Action" (140ff) and "Jeffersonian Christianity" (151ff).

Boorstin places as an epigraph on his study a sentence from Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* that should give pause to those who want to separate religion from the civil order: "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God?"

46 See Tetlow, "The Great Tradition," 1979, 424.

47 William G. McLoughlin, Jr., *Modern Revivalism*, New York, Ronald Press, 1959, is the best study of the way revivals changed from being "prayed down" to being "worked up"--a process in which the colleges played their part.

The history of various revivals in the colleges is told passim in Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

48 Herman J. Muller, S.J., *The University of Detroit, 1877-1977*, Detroit, The University of Detroit, 1974, 21.

49 Cronin, 1982, 6.

50 This antimodernist movement is summarized neatly in Robert T. Handy, *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977, 287-294.

We probably owe to H. L. Mencken the intransigent belief that the Puritans were infected with "puritanism," viz., fundamentalism. Little is further from the truth. And we surely owe to aggressive secularists the difficulty Americans face today of putting tranquil stress on fundamentals without being put among the stressful fundamentalists.

51 James H. Smylie, "Roads to Our Present," *Church Related Higher Education*, ed. R. R. Parsonage, Valley Forge, Pa., Judson Press, 1978, 144.

52 Smylie, 1978, 145.

53 Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, 166.

54 Rudolph, 1962, makes this argument.

55 Walter H. Hill, S.J., *Historical Sketch of the St. Louis University*, St. Louis, Patrick Fox, 1879, 259.

56 Power, 1958, 270. A few decades after the humbugging started, even Jesuits who were piously defending the classical curriculum would contend that "Creighton University has tried to arrange and apply its course in such a way as to be helpful to those who can profit by it," as has every other Jesuit college. M. P. Dowling, S.J., *Creighton University: Reminiscences*

- of the First Twenty-Five Years, Omaha, Burley Printing Co., 1903, 223.
- 57 Muller, 1976, 24.
 - 58 Muller, 1976, 24.
 - 59 Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: The American Undergraduate Course of Study since 1636*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977, 127-128.
 - 60 Ernest L. Boyer and Fred M. Hechinger, *Higher Learning in the Nation's Service*, Washington, D.C., The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981, 13. Boyer and Hechinger address "service" as it has emerged during the 1960s and 1970s.
 - 61 Robert I. Gannon, *The Poor Old Liberal Arts*, New York, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1961, 152.
 - 62 Boyer and Hechinger, 1981, 7.
 - 63 *More Than Survival*, A Commentary with Recommendations of the Carnegie Foundation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1975, 85.
 - 64 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), 92.
 - 65 Boyer and Hechinger, 1981, ch. 2, "A Tradition of Service."
 - 66 Mathews et al., *The Changing Agenda for American Higher Education*, Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, n.d., reports on the "Airlie House Conference" that heard a cacaphony of opinions on mission from the likes of Amitai Etzioni, Earl Cheit, Dyckman Vermilye, Frank Newman, and Edmundo O. Wilson.
 - 67 *Time*, September 27, 1982, 66-73.
 - 68 Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, 104ff.
 - 69 John LaFarge, S.J., *The Jesuits in Modern Times*, New York, America Press, 1928, 88.
 - 70 Gannon, 1961, 152.
 - 71 *General Education in a Free Society*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945, 39-41.
 - 72 Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, 96.
 - 73 Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, 96.
 - 74 See Power, 1958, 213-233.
 - 75 Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2 vols., New York, Oxford University Press, 1962, II, 286-291.
 - 76 Boyer and Hechinger, 1981, 12-13.
 - 77 Raphael N. Hamilton, S.J., *The Story of Marquette University*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1953, passim.
 - 78 Cronin, 1982, 133, citing *Woodstock Letters*, 53 (1924), 347-348. *Project 1: An Overview* (April, 1974) gives information on programs current in Jesuit schools today. See Appendix B.
 - 79 Gleason, 1967, 46.
 - 80 "Report on the Committee on the Course of Studies," June, 1920,

Course of Studies for the Colleges of the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus. This book's title is from the first document, 1911. It is without editor, page numbering, or press, and was apparently printed for province members.

- 81 Hill, 1879, 157.
- 82 According to Power, 1958, 84, the movement from the six or seven-year sequence to the four-plus-four was called "the St. Louis Plan." Regis in Denver appears to have been the last to adopt the plan: *Higher Education Resources*, St. Louis, Missouri Province, N.D. (probably 1969), 3. I presume this clasp-bound document was prepared for work in the province assembly on higher education.
- 83 Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1966, 16.
- 84 Bell, 1966, 19ff.
- 85 Andrew C. Smith, S.J., "The Requirement for the A.B. Degree in Jesuit Colleges," *JEQ* 11 (1948), 35-40. Detroit dropped Greek in 1919 and Latin in 1960 (Muller, 1976, 296).
- 86 Matthew G. Sullivan, S.J., "The Influence on Curriculum of Jesuit Tradition," *Proceedings of the Santa Clara Institute for Jesuit College Deans*, Andrew C. Smith, S.J., ed., Jesuit Education Association, private circulation, 1955, p. 92. See also *ibid*, p. 70, Julian Maline, S.J., "The Status Quo of Jesuit Curricula."
- 87 "Resolutions" in *Proceedings*, ed. A. Smith, S.J., 1955, 188. This was Resolution 9. In the earlier Resolution 6, the deans resolved to put into "institutional and course objectives" a stronger "Christian social awareness" (188).
- 88 Robert Maynard Hutchins, *The Great Conversation: The Substance of a Liberal Education*, Great Books of the Western World, ed. R. M. Hutchins, Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 1952, 27.
- 89 Easter Letter, 1978, #41.
- 90 "Report on the Committee on the Course of Studies, June, 1920. See footnote 80.
- 90a Julian Maline, S.J., "The Status Quo of Jesuit Curricula," *Proceedings*, ed. A. Smith, S.J., 1955, 72-73.
- 91 *Missions of the College Curriculum*, Commentary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977, 242.
- 92 Mayhew and Ford, 1971, 82.
- 93 Robert F. Weiss, S.J., "The Environment for Learning on the Catholic Campus," Hassenger, 1967, 57-82.
- 94 John D. Donovan, *The Academic Man in the Catholic College*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1964, 197.
- 95 Timothy L. Bouscaren, S.J., "The Challenge from Secular Education," *Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the Missouri Province Teachers' Association*, Aug. 1-3, 1922, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, 1922, n.p.

- 96 Winthrop Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*, New York, Harper and Row, 1963, 217.
- 97 Hamilton, 1953, 268. Power, 1958, 95, is blunter and speaks from the lay perspective: "They were employees and they were treated as such." Power continues by adding somewhat truculently that their status "was probably little better than that of grade school boys," which seems to have been fairly true of most faculty members in whatever residential college during the early 19th century, but probably overstates the situation of doctors, lawyers, dentists, accountants, and the rest who staffed Jesuit professional colleges during this century. They certainly were second-class citizens, though.
- 98 Ganss, *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, [457].
- 99 Cronin, 1982, 81.
- 100 Donovan, 1964, is such a study.
- 101 Donovan, 1964, 23; Power, 1958, 95.
- 102 Power, 1958, 95.
- 103 *Catholic Colleges and Schools in the United States*, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1936, Part II, 10. Donovan, 1964, 24, reports that they were approaching 70 percent in 1964, but he does not cite his source.
- 104 These data are taken from *Continuity and Discontinuity*, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York, McGraw Hill, 1973, 11ff.
- 105 Morison and Commager, 1962, II, 366.
- 106 James Hennesey, S.J., "Catholic Colleges and Their Sponsoring Religious Communities: An Historical Perspective," *Working Papers*, The National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities, June, 1979, privately circulated, 7.
- 107 Charles M. O'Hara, S.J., "An Analysis of National Statistics, 1946-47," *JEQ* 9 (1947) 165. O'Hara reports that the total enrollment (as opposed to full-time) went from 38,973 to 81,794, an increase of 112.87 percent.
- 108 Muller, 1976, 230-231.
- 109 *Papers of Study Commission 5: Public Policy Issues*, The National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities, June, 1979, privately circulated, collects data from every source on the enrollment changes.
- 110 *Project 1: An Overview* (April, 1974), 34-35 and Tables XII to XIV.
- 111 *Project 1: An Overview* (April, 1974), 140-142.
- 112 Newman worked his equation--true academic excellence is the finest educational service to religion--in another age, and we have had trouble grasping the change in its parameters during this age. Most institutions carried on the debate, often very consequential. One particularly sharp and well-informed debate was occasioned by the doctoral dissertation of Gregory Lucey, S.J., *A Case Study: The Meaning and Maintenance of Catholicity as a Characteristic of American Higher Education* (1978, University of Wisconsin). Lucey contended that "academic excellence" had done damage to the "Catholicity" of Marquette University; Vice-President

Quentin L. Quade and President John P. Raynor, S.J., among others, printed informed and thoughtful responses denying the thesis.

- 113 Jencks and Riesman, 1968, 368; and see Donovan, 1964, Pt. II.
- 114 G.C. 31 abrogated Decree 141 of the *Collectio Decretorum*, a law laid down by G.C. 25 that all faculty members in Jesuit institutions be Jesuit, if possible; and if not, that they be men of known faith and virtue.
See John W. Padberg, "The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of Their History," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, Vol. VI, 1 and 2, January and March, 1974, 95.
- 115 Gleason, 1967, 51.
- 116 *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*, New York, McGraw Hill, 1973.
- 117 The Commission added three further priorities: the enhancement of constructive change, the achievement of more effective governance, and the assurance and more effective use of resources.
- 118 Trilling's remark is in *Mind in the Modern World*, New York, Viking Press, 1972, 29.
- 119 *Priorities*, 1973, 25.
- 120 Pattillo and Mackenzie, 1966, 7.
- 121 Tetlow, "The Great Tradition," 1979, is a report on this meeting.
- 122 *Endangered Service: Independent Colleges, Public Policy and the First Amendment*, Nashville, National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education, 1976, privately circulated.
The denominations were concerned in the mid-1970s about the impact of federal legislation on their independence. This was one of the motives for the National Congress.
- 123 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 57.
- 124 Miller Upton, "Report to the Members of the Council for Higher Education of the United Church of Christ," June 2, 1976, mimeographed and privately circulated.
- 125 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 83-89.
- 126 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), 99.
- 127 Keynote Address, multilithed copies were circulated at the National Congress, June, 1979.
- 128 This and the following cases are reported by Robert Rue Parsonage, "An Overview of Current Denominational Policies and Studies in Higher Education," in Parsonage, 1978, 189-302.
- 129 This organism goes back to 1910 and includes the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (13 institutions), the American Lutheran Church (12 institutions), and the Lutheran Church in America (18 institutions).
- 130 Parsonage, 1978, 207-211.
- 131 Arthur L. Olsen, ed., *Cooperation for the Future*, Washington, D.C., January, 1976, 13. Cited in Parsonage, 1978, 210.
- 132 The Lutheran Church in America undertook a particularly interesting study

- on the image that the colleges project and the expectations entertained about the colleges by church people. See Merton P. Strommen, *A Survey of Images and Expectations of LCA Colleges*, New York, Division for Mission in North America, Department for Education, Lutheran Church in America, June, 1976.
- 133 Parsonage, 1978, 225-229.
- 134 *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), 102, gives Article II of the AJCU Constitution, which states its purposes and objectives.
- 135 There are interesting passages in the report that lays all this out: "Report of the Ad Interim Committee on the Church in Higher Education, June, 1977." It contains what Parsonage rightly identifies as "the rationale for the church's involvement in higher education" (Parsonage, 1978, 227).
- 136 Lloyd J. Averill, ed., "The Church College and the Public Good," Council on Protestant Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., January, 1969. The Covenant is in an appendix.
- 137 In a book of nearly 400 pages, Catholic curricular developments are mentioned in passing a handful of times. The Catholic story is not considered relevant to the book's analysis of American undergraduate education from 1636 to 1977. If Rudolph is mistaken, no writer I have read has protested his error.
- 138 *Time*, September 27, 1982, 66-73.
- 139 The provincial is A. J. Burrowes, S.J. Letter, dated August 9, 1915, St. Louis, in *Course of Studies for the Colleges of the Missouri Province*, 1911, n.p.
- 140 Matthew G. Sullivan, S.J. "The Influence on Curriculum of Jesuit Traditions," in *Proceedings*, ed. A. Smith, S.J., 1955, 90.
- 141 Cronin, 1982, 133-134, gives a list of the recommendations made. See also Donohue, 1963, 54ff.
- 142 *Societatis Iesu Constitutiones et Epitome Instituti, Romae, apud Curiam P. Generalis*, 1949, (#393). This is the fourth revision.
- 143 *Epitome*, 1941, (#397).
- 144 Donohue, 1963, 54.
- 145 *Report of the Commission on Higher Education of the American Assistancy of the Society of Jesus, 1931-32*, mimeographed and bound, private circulation, 193-197, reproduces the General's letter.
- 146 Donohue, 1963, 55.
- 147 See *JEQ*, 11 (October, 1948) for the documents: Letter of Fr. General John Baptist Janssens covering the *Instructio*, 69-71; Letter of Fr. General Wlodimir Ledochowski (in English) and the revised *Instructio* (in Latin), 72-86.
- 148 The proceedings of all of these workshops were published, except the final deans' meeting at Seattle University in 1970, which produced no proceedings. For years, the schools' spirit of cooperation was strained by syllabi and examinations standardized at the province and the assistancy level.

How intense the pressure for standardization in Jesuit schools became is visible in the *Manual for Jesuit High School Administrators*, 2nd edition, New York, Jesuit Educational Association, 1952, a 400-page vademecum that would make anyone who had never met a Jesuit principal think they were all martinets. The pressure for conformity was kept on the colleges by constant surveys and reports, and by constant remarks to the effect that it was hard to understand why all of the colleges did not conform to this or that norm set by the JEA.

149 Power, 1958, 354-358.

150 John Tracy Ellis started a years-long debate with his paper to the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs on May 14, 1955, in St. Louis, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life." After he printed it in *Thought* (Autumn, 1955), he was responded to almost weekly in *Commonweal*, *Catholic World*, and *America*, where he printed his follow-up (April 7, 1956).

A critical analysis of this debate would make an interesting thesis or dissertation in intellectual history.

151 *Project 1: Overview*, (April, 1974), 110-111.

152 *Project 1: Overview*, (April, 1974), 105.

153 See Richard A. Hill, S.J., "The Pastoral Guide to Canon Law: Religious," *Chicago Studies*, XV (Fall, 1976). Hill sketches the history of religious life from the ravages of suppressions (between 1773 and 1810, religious men declined from 300,000 to 30,000 and women suffered a similar fate), through the homogenization of the 19th century Catholic Revival and the codification of Canon Law in 1917--to the drama of "*Perfectae Caritatis*."

154 G.C. 31, "The Renewal of Our Laws," decree 2, no. 2, in *DocsGC31&32*, p. 73.

155 G.C. 31, "The Mission of the Society of Jesus Today," decree 1, no. 2, *ibid.*, p. 61.

156 See, for instance, "Spiritual Renewal," given in Rome, June 24, 1971, *Selected Letters and Addresses, Vol. I: Challenge to Religious Life Today*, ed. Jerome Aixala, S.J., St. Louis, Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1979, pp. 41-50.

157 See John Padberg, S.J., "Historical Preface," *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations*, St. Louis, Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1977, 55.

158 *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), pp. 165-66. Two of the staff who worked on Project 1 had gone through the whole process of the Conference's formation, as provincials.

159 *Project 1: An Introduction* (March, 1974), pp. 3-7.

160 Arrupe, "Spiritual Renewal," 1979, p. 41.

161 *Project 1: Introduction* (March, 1974), 15.

162 *Project 1: Introduction* (March, 1974), 2-10.

163 *Project 1: Overview*, (April, 1974), 55.

164 Jencks and Riesman, 1968, 346, report that Webster College in St. Louis was the first Catholic college turned over to a lay board, followed by

St. Louis University, which was "always in recent years in the forefront of change."

See *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), 38 and Table XVIII, 145.

- 165 *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), 38, and Table XIX, 146.
- 166 Paul J. Reiss, "Faculty and Administration: The Jesuit-Lay Character," *JEQ*, 32 (October, 1969), citations are all on page 116.
- 167 *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), 13 and 14.
- 168 Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "The Modern Religious Superior," given in Rome, April 10, 1972, *Challenge*, 1979, p. 79.
- 169 American Jesuits were not the only ones feeling alienation from their colleges. Delegates to G.C. 31 could not finish their treatment of education in 1965 and returned to it in 1966, using simultaneous translation for the first time. The "Historical Preface" reports that "some called into doubt the very usefulness of the apostolate" ("Historical Preface," *DocsGC31&32*, p. 40). Actually, the decree itself records that some Jesuits consider our institutions "practically useless," which is fairly strong language even in Latin (G.C. 31, #499).

But of course some American Jesuits had the added alienation, and some the added gleeful attraction, of the countercultural revolution--which turned both off to institutions. It is hard to do justice to all this ruction, which scores of Jesuits in the best positions to know claimed was provoking feelings "ranging from 'sadness' through 'fear' to a sense of 'loss and betrayal'" (*Project 1: Issues*, April 1974, 15).

- 170 Father Paul FitzGerald, S.J., of Boston College, has completed a book on the gradual shift of academic governance from Rome to the institutions. His tentative title: *The Governance of Jesuit Colleges in the United States, 1920 to 1970*; and subtitle: *The Role of the Jesuit Education Association*. The book is to be brought out by the University of Notre Dame Press late in 1983.

William Leahy, S.J., studying history at Stanford University, is at work on a dissertation on the educational policies of the JEA from 1930.

It is astonishing that he is the only Jesuit graduate student--in education, American intellectual history, sociology, or political science--to have mined the limited, available, rich lode of JEA history. The archives are now deposited at Boston College and documents in the Roman Curia are made available readily. But the purple ditto is fading and the key men are passing on.

- 171 G.C. 31, decree 28, no. 4, "The Apostolate of Education, pp. 228-229, marginal ref. 500 in *DocsGC31&32*.

Among the Americans at the congregation were these who had been or were or were to be presidents of one of our institutions: Henry Birkenhauer, Paul C. Reinert, A. Arbie Lemieux, Vincent O'Keefe, A. William Crandall, Andrew C. Smith, Harold O. Small, and others. George E. Ganss backed them with the historian's concrete instance about Ignatius's adaptability.

- 172 *Project 1: Overview* (April, 1974), 83.
- 173 The conclusion drawn from the first informal survey of opinion among Jesuits in education, taken during the summer and fall of 1973, was

that "many individuals and communities" in higher education had lost "confidence in the *religious* character of their work" (*Project 1: Issues* April 1974, 15-16). The provincials were therefore concerned to invite them "to discover again that apostolic drive" that had inserted the Society into education in the first place (Arrupe, "Spiritual Renewal," *Challenge*, 1979, 44).

- 174 Arrupe, "Spiritual Renewal," *Challenge*, 1979, 41.
- 175 In the scores of studies and statements (many truly excellent) written during the early 1970's, Jesuits commonly envisioned higher education as a secular social structure that we were trying to penetrate and influence. We did not see it as a religiously oriented component of American civil religion--which in historical fact it has been. I am not confident that we do yet, otherwise our images of excellence and success would not be Harvard and Amherst and we would be more interested in Manchester College and Notre Dame.
- 176 Actually, the provincials were already thinking of the institutions over against the Society in 1973. See *Project 1: Issues* (April, 1974), 18.
- 177 Cuninggim, "Varieties," 1978, 32. The provincials concurred in this opinion early on: "The extent to which the Society's apostolate and the institutions' purposes coincide is not at all clear" (*Project 1: Issues*, April 1974, 4).
- 178 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 6.
- 179 Easter Letter, 1978, #24.
- 180 In the interests of fairness, we ought to recall that the initiative at Austin College lay with the president, and not with the churchmen. The feat of drawing the college and the denomination into dialog has given President John Moseley nearly legendary status among those interested in the common mission.
- 181 See, for instance, *Project 1: Issues* (April, 1974), v.
- 182 Few did and none I know of felt encouraged to. At the risk of missing one or other who made an effort, I call attention to the work of Victor Yanitelli, S.J., then president of St. Peter's College, in *Project 1: National Consultation*, Appendix B, pp. 178-192.
- 183 *Project 1: Introduction* (March, 1974), 11.
- 184 *Project 1: Introduction* (March, 1974), Appendix, gives a precis of the 148 written responses from around the Assistancy to the original questions cited above.
- 185 Technically, the staff of the Jesuit Conference were responsible for the publication of the booklets, which are like reports on the provincials' actions. Actually, the provincials did a meticulous preview of all of the drafts except *Overview*, which they merely studied.
- 186 See J. A. Tetlow, S.J., "Readiness for Ministry," *America*, March 25, 1978, 233-236.
- 187 Parsonage, 1978, 189-231.
- 188 William J. Mehok, S.J., *Some Notes on the Teaching Manpower of the Jesuit Order*, New York, Jesuit Education Association, 1965.

- 189 The problems and opportunities in higher education are introduced by three separate lists of changes; in our own institutions, in the whole Church, and in American higher education. The striking fact that each of these areas generates its own literature--very rarely in dialogue with the other two--indicates how complex a problem Jesuits in higher education face today. See pages 13-15.
- 190 These nine plans were elaborated by the Conference staff as concrete realizations of the way the provincials wanted Jesuits to plan. But instead of being taken as models of a way to plan, they were read as concrete proposals and criticized as such. It has to be said, however, that more than anything else in Project 1, these "options" caught men's attention.
- 191 It is worth recording that the summaries of the provinces' participation were drawn up by the Province Correspondents. Denis Collins (Cal.); Thomas Savage (Chi.); Thomas Bain (Det.); Charles Costello and James McAndrews (Md.); Joseph Gough (Mo.); James Bowler (N.E.); George Lundy (N.O.); Edward Horgan and Martin Mahoney (N.Y.); James Meehan (Ore.); John Zuercher (Wisc.);
- 192 *Project 1: Some Options* (August, 1974), ix.
- 193 *Project 1: Some Options* (August, 1974), xii.
- 194 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), 59-63.
- 195 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), xii.
- 196 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), xiv.
- 197 G.C. 32, *Documents*, Document 4, "Our Mission Today," #122.
- 198 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), xii.
- 199 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), 35.
- 200 *Project 1: National Consultation* (February, 1975), 36.
- 201 Ibid.
- 202 Three of the five staff members were at the Congregation: James C. Connor, Robert A. Mitchell, John W. Padberg.
- 203 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 11.
- 204 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 12.
- 205 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 12. This is number eight.
- 206 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), Appendix, "The Process," 14-18.
- 207 Jencks and Riesman, 1968, 374.
- 208 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 16-18 gives the list.
- 209 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), 30. I have added the emphases.
- 210 G.C. 32, *Documents*, #229 and #318. The citation below on statutes is from Document 11, "Union of Minds and Hearts," #222.

- 211 "Since there must be great variety in particular cases in accordance with the circumstances of place and persons, this present treatment will not descend further to what is particular, except to state that there should be rules which come down to everything necessary in each college" (*Constitutions*, IV, ch. 7, [395]). See also numbers [136, 428, 455, 496-497].
- 212 Rudolph, 1977, 86. The phrase is Rudolph's.
- 213 Timothy S. Healey, S.J., "The Ignatian Heritage for Today's College, *America*, November 5, 1977, 304-306. The citation is on 306.
The inaugurals of Thomas Acker and Charles Currie were reported in *NJNEWS*, November, 1982, 3.
- 214 From "Our Mission Today": "It is important that whether a Jesuit works in a team or whether he works alone, he must be, and must feel himself to be, sent" *DocsGC31&32*, p. 433.
- 215 See, for instance, G.C. 32, pp. 433-434 (marginal refs. 112, 114, 116).
- 216 The leaflet is dated June 21, 1982.
- 217 It is worth jumping ahead here to note what the provincials would later state in the Easter Letter, no. 51:
"We promise to support community leadership, the rectors especially, in the responsibility which the Society has given them to develop strong community participation in the progressive refinement of rationale statements and plans of action."
- 218 G.C. 32, "Our Mission Today," p. 427 (marginal ref. 94). This clause is from a significant section, "Social Involvement." Anyone who thinks that the idea of writing rationales came from a textbook on management ought to read ## 92-94.
- 219 G.C. 32, p. 433 (marginal ref. 114).
- 220 *Project 1: Agreements and Decisions* (October, 1975), p. 17.
- 221 This document is the appendix in this booklet. The paragraph numbers have been added.
- 222 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 1.
- 223 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 4.
- 224 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 7.
- 225 Easter Letter, 1978, nos. 13 and 14.
- 226 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 18.
- 227 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 20; see also nos. 15-20.
- 228 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 23.
- 229 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 28.
- 230 Easter Letter, 1978, nos. 30-31.
- 231 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 32.
- 232 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 36.
- 233 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 38.
- 234 Easter Letter, 1978, nos. 44 and 45.

235 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 46.

236 Easter Letter, 1978, no. 52.

237 William V. Bangert, S.J., *A History of the Society of Jesus*, St. Louis, Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972, p. 506.

238 See Gregory F. Lucey, S.J., *The Meaning and Maintenance of Catholicity as a Distinctive Characteristic of American, Catholic Higher Education: A Case Study*, published dissertation, Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1978.

Lucey discovered "that the university's mission was coextensive with the educational mission of the Church," and within its ambience, "the questions of ethical values, and religious questions about life, death, and the existence of God were academically acceptable." But he also discovered that "the successful efforts of the university to improve its academic quality were seen to move the institution toward academic professionalism to the detriment of its Catholicity," and that appointing, rewarding, developing faculty moved it toward "professionalism to the detriment of Catholicity." These statements are in Lucey's precis in *Dissertation Abstracts*, Series A: Humanities and Social Sciences, February 1979, Vol. 39, #8, p. 4762-A. See also fn. 112 above.

239 "The Jesuit schools are . . . understood as extensions of the inspiration and action of the Society itself since they are concrete embodiments of its apostolic aim" (Donohue, 1963, 185). When that was written, the meaning of "embodiment" had already shifted. The Society's spirituality was no longer a *causa formalis*; it had become more a *motivum*.

240 David Riesman, "Reflections on Catholic Colleges, Especially Jesuit Institutions," *The Journal of General Education*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (Summer 1982), 106-119, 115.

241 *Missions of the College Curriculum*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977, 151. Another consoling opinion (250):

"Those who assert that colleges should exert no influence on the personal values and morality of their students are . . . in error. Colleges cannot help but have an influence."

242 George Ganss, in a footnote in his edition of the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, 1970, p. 210, lists eleven "perennial principles and objectives in educational work which he [Ignatius] expressed in his Constitutions." They are important in understanding more than the Constitutions.

Allan Farrell, 1938, cites Father General Luis Martin (address, January 1, 1893) on the permanent notes in Jesuit education (p. 402) and then goes on to add a list of ten principles that he himself sees in the *Ratio* (pp. 403 and 404).

Each time I have cited these to faculties or administrators or board members at Jesuit institutions, I have found them enthusiastically listened to.

243 *DocsGC31&32*, pp. 423-424 (marginal ref. no. 84). This is the opening sentence of decree 4.

244 Ibid.

- 245 See Robert I. Burns, S.J., "The Apostolate of Education and the Jesuits," paper delivered at the Ignatian Spirituality and Reform; An International Symposium, University of San Francisco, July 1973, 35-36:
"Genial dishonesty, doctrinaire intransigence, and uncontrolled drift can combine to destroy all but sporadic or peripheral initiative . . . Essentially [preventing the secularizing of a Jesuit institution] comes down to confronting the possibilities of a given school with one's own fundamental purposes, followed by a community act of decision: What does this local group, or province, or Order *want* this school to become?"
- 246 Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "Three Models and Three Loves," *Other Apostolates Today*, 1981, p. 7.
- 247 See *DocsGC31&32*, p. 405 (marginal refs. nos. 28-29), of decree 2, "Jesuits Today." The citation is from Document 4, "Our Mission Today," p. 426 (marginal ref. no. 92).
- 248 Bangert, 1972, p. 506.

The Institute of Jesuit Sources

Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

announces

Available Now

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE JESUIT THEATER

A Posthumous Work, by

William H. McCabe, S.J. (1893-1962)

Edited by Louis J. Oldani, S.J.

362 pages

\$19.00 quality paperbound (sewn)

ISBN 0-912422-62-9

\$23.00 clothbound

ISBN 0-912422-63-7

This engaging, scholarly, and fully documented work is, in the opinion of competent judges, the most comprehensive treatment of the Jesuit drama which has appeared so far.

It is important for study of the history of drama, which was considerably influenced by the Jesuit theater, differently in various countries.

In PART I, McCabe traces the origin, purpose, and evolution of the extensive network of Jesuit college theaters from 1550 to 1773. He treats the playwrights, the plays, the techniques of staging, the actors and audiences, and the significance of Jesuit theaters in the history of drama.

In PART II, he makes an intensive study of one representative theater, that in the English Jesuit college at St. Omers, Belgium.

In PART III, he similarly studies one representative playwright and his work, the British Joseph Simons, S.J., whose five important tragedies were performed widely throughout continental Europe. McCabe explores these plays in relation to traditional features of Jesuit tragedy, details Simons' substitutes for the chorus of classical tragedy, and analyzes his characters to elucidate types of the tragic hero.

There were 148 Jesuit colleges or universities by 1587, 372 by 1625, and 612 by 1710. In virtually all of them, at least one and usually two plays were performed by the students each year. An estimated 100,000 plays appeared on the Jesuit stage. The Jesuit school drama trained such premier dramatists as Calderón, Corneille, Lope de Vega, and Molière.

To research a complete history of this massive development seems too vast to be possible. But "the nearest approach to this staggering task," the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967) states in Vol. 7, p. 893, "is contained in the incomplete study by W. H. McCabe, . . . whose manuscript has been available" to this editor [probably Harold C. Gardiner, S.J.].

COMPANION VOLUMES IN PREPARATION

Nearing completion is another book, which will present examples in the concrete of the plays treated by McCabe: *The English Jesuit Theater; Five Tragedies of Joseph Simons, S.J.*, in English Translation. Edited by Louis J. Oldani, S.J., and Philip C. Fischer, S.J.

Also in preparation is *The Jesuit Theater in Italy*, by Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.

Editor's Foreword

PART I. THE JESUIT THEATER

1. The Jesuit College	1
2. The Rise of the Jesuit Theater	11
3. The Purpose of the Jesuit Theater	19
4. Actors, Dramatists, Spectators	32
5. The Plays	37
6. The Jesuit Theater in the History of Drama	67

PART II. THE COLLEGE THEATER OF ST. OMERS

69

7. The English College of St. Omers	71
10. Documents Concerning the St. Omers Theater	103

PART III. JOSEPH SIMONS AND JESUIT TRAGEDY

131

12. The Five Tragedies of Joseph Simons	131
13. The Jesuit Tragic Principle	144
14. The Hero	157
15. Female Roles	178
16. Substitutes for the Chorus	198
18. Miracle and Marvel	222
20. Dramatic Value	254

APPENDICES

3. Stage Directions from St. Omers Plays	280
4. Man's Super-natural Destiny	290
5. Jesuit Influence on National Drama	296

BIBLIOGRAPHY

299 through 330

 THE AUTHOR

William H. McCabe, S.J. (1893-1962) first composed this work as his dissertation for the Ph.D., which he received from **Cambridge University**, England, in 1929. As a professor of English at **St. Louis University** (1930-1940) he was revising his draft into a book, which had been accepted for publication by a university press in England. But completion of publication was impeded by his appointment as President of **Rockhurst College** in Kansas City (1940-1945) and of **Creighton University** in Omaha (1945-1950). After that, as professor of English at **Marquette University** in Milwaukee, he worked at further revisions, until ill health in 1958 and then death in 1962 terminated his work on this project.

 THE EDITOR

Louis J. Oldani, S.J., associate professor of English at Rockhurst College, received his Ph.D. (1972) from the University of Pennsylvania, and has been a Mellon Fellow at the University of Kansas. He has published articles on Theodore Dreiser, Ezra Pound, and Muriel Spark.

THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES

ORDER BLANK

Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Phone (314) 652-5737

TOTALS at
LIST PRICES

(CIRCLE THE BINDING desired)

- ★ _____ Arrupe, *Challenge to Religious Life Today: Letters & Addresses — I* _____
Cloth, \$7.00 Sewn paper, \$6.00
- ★ _____ Arrupe, *Justice With Faith Today: Letters & Addresses — II* _____
Cloth, \$8.00 Sewn paper, \$7.00
- ★ _____ Arrupe, *Other Apostolates Today: Letters & Addresses — III* _____
Cloth, \$9.00 Sewn paper, \$8.00
- _____ Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus* _____
Glued paper, \$9.00
- _____ Bangert, *Bibliographical Essay on History of S.J.* _____
Sewn paper, \$2.50 Glued paper, \$1.50
- ☆ _____ Clancy, *The Conversational Word of God* _____
Cloth, \$5.00 Sewn paper, \$2.50
- _____ Clancy, *Introduction to Jesuit Life . . . Through 435 Years* _____
Cloth, \$12.00 Glued paper, \$5.50
- _____ *Conferences on the Chief Decrees of General Congregation 32* _____
Sewn paper, \$4.50 Glued paper, \$3.50
- ★ _____ Correia-Afonso, *Letters from the Mughal Court (1580-1583)* _____
Cloth, \$9.00
- _____ DeGuibert, *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine & Practice* _____
Glued paper, \$8.00
- ★ _____ DeMello, *Sadhana: A Way To God* _____
Cloth, \$6.00 Sewn paper, \$5.00 Glued paper, \$4.00
- _____ *Documents of General Congregation 31 & 32* _____
Sewn paper, \$6.00
- _____ Egan, *Spiritual Exercises & Ignatian Mystical Horizon* _____
Sewn paper, \$7.00 Glued paper, \$6.00
- ☆ _____ Fleming, *Spir. Exercises: Literal Trans. and Contemp. Reading* _____
Cloth, \$12.00 Sewn paper, \$8.50
- _____ Fleming, *Contemporary Reading of the Spiritual Exercises* _____
Sewn paper, \$4.00 Glued paper, \$3.00
- _____ Futrell, *Making an Apostolic Community of Love* _____
Sewn paper, \$5.00 Glued paper, \$4.00
- _____ Ganss, *Jesuit Educational Tradition & St. Louis University* _____
Cloth, \$3.25
- _____ Gruenberg, *Labor Peacemaker: Life & Works of Leo C. Brown, S.J.* _____
Cloth, \$8.50 Sewn paper, \$7.00 Glued paper, \$6.00
- _____ Ignatius, *Constitutions SJ: Intro, Trans., Commentary by Ganss* _____
Glued paper, \$7.00
- _____ Iparraguirre, *Bibliographical Orientations on Cons. SJ* _____
Glued paper, \$1.60
- _____ *Jesuit Religious Life Today* _____
Sewn paper, \$4.00 Glued paper, \$3.00
- _____ McCabe, *Intro to the Jesuit Theater* _____
Cloth, \$23.00 Sewn paper, \$19.00
- ☆ _____ Pousset, *Life in Faith & Freedom — Fessard's Dialectic* _____
Cloth, \$9.00 Sewn paper, \$8.00 Glued paper, \$7.00
- ☆ _____ Schütte, *Valignano's Mission Principles for Japan, Vol. I, Part I* _____
Cloth, \$14.00 Sewn paper, \$12.00
- ☆ _____ Toner, *Commentary on Ignatius' Rules for the Discernment of Spirits* _____
Cloth, \$14.00 Sewn paper, \$11.00
- _____ Wulf (ed), *Ignatius: His Personality & Spiritual Heritage* _____
Glued paper, \$7.00
- TOTAL at LIST prices _____

DISCOUNTS:

On \$30.00 up at list prices: 10%
On \$60.00 up at list prices: 20%

Subtract discount, if any

• POSTAGE and handling, if prepaid \$ 1.25

Amount to be paid \$ _____

*This may be OMITTED on PREPAID orders of \$30.00 or over at LIST prices

★ For sale by us ONLY in North America.

☆ For sale by us ONLY in the First World (Americas, Europe, Australia, N. Zealand).

Single issues, 75 CENTS--Double issues, \$1.50

- Vol. I, no. 1 (Sept., 1969). J.R. Sheets, S.J. A Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit: His Challenges and Opportunities.
- Vol. I, no. 2 (Nov., 1969). G.E. Ganss, S.J. The Authentic Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Facts of History and Terminology.
- Vol. II, no. 1 (Feb., 1970). W.J. Burke, S.J. Institution and Person.
- Vol. II, no. 2 (April, 1970). J.C. Futrell, S.J. Ignatian Discernment.
- Vol. II, no. 3 (Sept., 1970). B.J.F. Lonergan, S.J. The Response of the Jesuit, as Priest and Apostle.
- Vol. III, no. 1 (Feb., 1971). J.H. Wright, S.J. Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation.
- Vol. III, no. 2 (April, 1971). V.J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Reflections on Jesuit Commitment.
- Vol. III, no. 3 (June, 1971). T.E. Clarke, S.J. Jesuit Commitment, Fraternal Covenant? J.C. Haughey, S.J. New Perspective on Religious Commitment.
- Vol. III, no. 4 (Sept., 1971). J.J. Toner, S.J. A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will.
- Vol. III, no. 5 (Nov., 1971). J.R. Sheets, S.J. Toward a Theology of the Religious Life, A Sketch.
- Vol. IV, no. 1 (Jan., 1972). D.B. Knight, S.J. St. Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty.
- Vol. IV, no. 2 (March, 1972). Two Discussions: (1) Spiritual Direction. (2) Leadership and Authority.
- Vol. IV, no. 3 (June, 1972). L. Orsy, S.J. Questions about Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation.
- Vol. IV, no. 4 (Oct., 1972). On Continuity and Change. A Symposium by Frs. Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, and Dulles.
- Vol. IV, no. 5 (Nov., 1972). J.C. Futrell, S.J. Communal Discernment: Reflections on Experience.
- Vol. V, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1973). V.J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Renewal: Call and Response. \$1.50
- Vol. V, no. 3 (April, 1973). Place of Art in Jesuit Life. V.R. Pedro Arrupe, S.J. and C.J. McNaspy, S.J.
- Vol. V, no. 4 (June, 1973). J.C. Haughey, S.J. Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits.
- Vol. V, no. 5 (Oct., 1973). L. Orsy, S.J. Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment.
- Vol. VI, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1974). J.W. Padberg, S.J. General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of their History. \$1.50
- Vol. VI, no. 3 (April, 1974). D.B. Knight, S.J. Joy and Judgment in Religious Obedience.
- Vol. VI, no. 4 (June, 1974). J.J. Toner, S.J. Deliberation That Started the Jesuits. A Commentary on *Deliberatio primorum Patrum*.
- Vol. VI, no. 5 (Oct., 1974). R.L. Schmitt, S.J. The Christ-Experience and Relationship Fostered in the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius.
- Vol. VII, no. 1 (Jan., 1975). J.H. Wright, S.J., G.E. Ganss, S.J., L. Orsy, S.J. On Thinking with the Church Today.
- Vol. VII, no. 2 (March, 1975). (1) G. Ganss, S.J. The Sodalities of Our Lady and Christian Life Communities. (2) Specimen copy of *Communication 2* (by Miss José Gsell) and 3 (by Sr. Françoise Vandermeersch, HHS).
- Vol. VII, no. 3 (June, 1975). W.J. Connolly, S.J. Contemporary Spiritual Direction: Scope and Principles.
- Vol. VII, no. 4 (Sept., 1975). T.E. Clarke, S.J. Ignatian Spirituality and Societal Consciousness. L. Orsy, S.J. Faith and Justice: Some Reflections.
- Vol. VII, no. 5 (Nov., 1975). M.J. Buckley, S.J. Confirmation of Promise: A Letter to George Ganss. J.W. Padberg, S.J. Continuity and Change in General Congregation XXXII.
- Vol. VIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1976). Charles E. O'Neill, S.J. *Acatamiento*: Ignatian Reverence in History and in Contemporary Culture.
- Vol. VIII, no. 2 & 3 (March & May, 1976). On Becoming Poor: A Symposium on Evangelical Poverty. Papers by H. de la Costa & E.F. Sheridan. Discussions by M.J. Buckley, W.J. Connolly, D.L. Fleming, G.E. Ganss, R.F. Harvanek, D.F.X. Meenan, C.E.O'Neill, L. Orsy. \$1.50
- Vol. VIII, no. 4 (Oct., 1976). R.L. Faricy, S.J. Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer.
- Vol. VIII, no. 5 (Dec., 1976). Michael J. Buckley, S.J. Jesuit Priesthood: Its Meaning and Commitments.
- Vol. IX, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1977). Changes in U.S. Jesuit Membership, 1958-1975: A Symposium. J.E. Becker, S.J. Discussions: L. Orsy, R.F. Harvanek, J.J. Gill, D.L. Fleming, W.J. Connolly, W.A. Barry. \$1.50

(continued on next page)

(continued)

- Vol. IX, no. 3 (May, 1977). R.F. Harvanek, S.J. The Reluctance to Admit Sin.
- Vol. IX, no. 4 (Sept., 1977). W.J. Connolly, S.J. & P. Land, S.J. Jesuit Spiritualities and the Struggle for Social Justice.
- Vol. IX, no. 5 (Nov., 1977). J.J. Gill, S.J. A Jesuit's Account of Conscience, For Personal and Organizational Effectiveness.
- Vol. X, no. 1 (Jan., 1978). A.C. Kammer, S.J. "Burn-Out"--Contemporary Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist.
- Vol. X, nos. 2 & 3 (March & May, 1978). Affectivity and Sexuality: Their Relationship to the Spiritual and Apostolic Life of Jesuits. Comments on Three Experiences, by W.A. Barry, S.J., Madeline Birmingham, R.C., W.J. Connolly, S.J., Robert J. Fahey, Virginia Sullivan Finn, and J.J. Gill, S.J. \$1.50
- Vol. X, no. 4 (Sept., 1978). Robert F. Harvanek, S.J. The Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus. Philip S. Land, S.J. Reactions to the Connolly-Land Letters on Faith and Justice. A Digest.
- Vol. X, no. 5 (Nov., 1978). John W. Padberg, S.J. Personal Experience and the *Spiritual Exercises*. The example of St. Ignatius.
- Vol. XI, no. 1 (Jan., 1979). Thomas H. Clancy, S.J. Feeling Bad about Feeling Good.
- Vol. XI, no. 2 (March, 1979). Dominic Maruca, S.J. Our Personal Witness as a Power toward Evangelizing Our Culture.
- Vol. XI, no. 3 (May 1979). J. Leo Klein, S.J. American Jesuits and the Liturgy.
- Vol. XI, no. 4 (Sept., 1979). Michael J. Buckley, S.J. Mission in Companionship: of Jesuit Community and Communion.
- Vol. XI, no. 5 (Nov., 1979). Joseph F. Conwell, S.J. The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Jesuit Ministries.
- Vol. XII, no. 1 (Jan., 1980). Thomas H. Clancy, S.J., editor. Veteran Witnesses: Their Experience of Jesuit Life.
- Vol. XII, no. 2 (March, 1980). Living Together in Mission: A Symposium on Small Apostolic Communities, by Peter J. Henriot, S.J. (coordinator), Joseph A. Appleyard, S.J., and J. Leo Klein, S.J.
- Vol. XII, no. 3 (May, 1980). Joseph F. Conwell, S.J. Living and Dying in the Society of Jesus; or, Endeavoring to Imitate Angelic Purity.
- Vol. XII, nos. 4 & 5 (Sept. & Nov., 1980). J. Peter Schineller, S.J. The Newer Approaches to Christology and Their Use in the Spiritual Exercises. \$1.50
- Vol. XIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1981). Simon Peter, S.J. Alcoholism and Jesuit Life: An Individual and Community Illness.
- Vol. XIII, no. 2 (March, 1981). Paul Begheyn, S.J. A Bibliography on St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises. A Working-Tool for American Students.
- Vol. XIII, no. 3 (May, 1981). George E. Ganss, S.J. Toward Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation, Especially as Described in the Papal and Jesuit Documents.
- Vol. XIII, no. 4 (Sept., 1981). James W. Reites, S.J. St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Jews.
- Vol. XIII, no. 5 (Nov., 1981). David J. O'Brien. The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education.
- Vol. XIV, no. 1 (Jan., 1982). John W. O'Malley, S.J. The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation: Some Recent Studies and Their Implications.
- Vol. XIV, no. 2 (March, 1982). Avery Dulles, S.J. Saint Ignatius and the Jesuit Theological Tradition.
- Vol. XIV, no. 3 (May, 1982). Paul V. Robb, S.J. Conversion as a Human Experience.
- Vol. XIV, no. 4 (Sept., 1982). Howard J. Gray, S.J. An Experience in Ignatian Government: Letters to a New Rector.
- Vol. XIV, no. 5 (Nov., 1982). Francisco Ivern, S.J. The Future of Faith and Justice: A Critical Review of Decree Four.
- Vol. XV, no. 1 (Jan., 1983). John W. O'Malley, S.J. The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study.
- Vol. XV, no. 2 (March, 1983). Francis A. Sullivan, S.J., and Robert L. Faricy, S.J. On Making the Spiritual Exercises for the Renewal of Jesuit Charisms.
- Vol. XV, Nos. 3 & 4 (May-September, 1983). John W. Padberg, S.J. The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the S.J. \$1.50
- Vol. XV, no. 5 and XVI, no. 1 (Dec., 1983 & Jan. 1984). Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J. The Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education: Perspective and Contexts. \$1.50



THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, FUSZ MEMORIAL
3700 WEST PINE BLVD.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63108
Assistancy Seminar: (314) 652-5737
Fusz Memorial: (314) 652-3700

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND PRICES, beginning July 1, 1982

I: To Persons OTHER THAN JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

These *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* are published by this Seminar. Naturally, they are focused on Jesuit problems and interests. But others who find these essays helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

THE PRICES

Constantly rising costs, especially for postage outside the U.S., force us with regret to raise our subscription prices. After July 1, 1982, they will be:

Per SINGLE COPY, 75 cents. (Double issues, \$1.50)

SUBSCRIPTIONS:	DOMESTIC	OUTSIDE THE U.S.A., surface mail
	\$4.50 for 1 year, \$9.00 for 2	\$8 for 1 year; \$16 for 2 years

FOREIGN AIR MAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Checks using foreign money (e.g., francs) must add \$1 for bank fees and exchange.	\$10 for 1 year in Central America; \$20 for 2 years \$14 in Europe, South America, Mediterranean Africa \$28 for 2 years \$16 in Asia, Africa, Pacific regions; \$32 for 2 years
--	--

ALL REQUESTS FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS, RENEWALS, AND CHANGES OF ADDRESS

should be mailed to: *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*
from THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR

(Payment should accompany all requests for subscriptions or renewals)

Circulation Department
Post Office Box 6148
Duluth, Minnesota 55806

REQUESTS for SINGLE COPIES or PAST ISSUES should be mailed to:

(Please add 75 cents for shipping)

The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial
3700 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

II. To JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

Copies of these *Studies* are mailed to you by means of labels prepared by National Jesuit News, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA 19131.

REQUESTS for CHANGES OF ADDRESS should be sent there. Your FORMER address and your new one are both necessary.

An exception: U.S. Jesuits LIVING OUTSIDE THE U.S. should send such requests for change of address here to the Assistancy Seminar, in St. Louis.

ALL PAST ISSUES are available. See the opposite page for A LIST OF THE TITLES.

The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

St. Louis, Missouri
Permit No. 2541

Serials Department
Bapst Library
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

